

2

14939



A KEY
TO THE
CHRONOLOGY OF THE HINDUS;
IN
A SERIES OF LETTERS;
IN WHICH
AN ATTEMPT IS MADE TO FACILITATE THE PROGRESS
OF CHRISTIANITY IN HINDOSTAN,
BY PROVING
THAT THE PROTRACTED NUMBERS OF
All Oriental Nations
WHEN REDUCED
AGREE WITH THE DATES GIVEN IN THE
Hebrew Text of the Bible.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

CAMBRIDGE:

Printed by J. Smith, Printer to the University;

FOR F. C. & J. RIVINGTON, LONDON;

AND SOLD BY DEIGHTON & BONS, NICHOLSON & SON, AND E. NEWBY,
CAMBRIDGE; J. PARKER, OXFORD; AND J. UPHAM, BATH.

1820

R. MICHAEL RY	
Acc	14939
Class	294.5
Date	14.9.60
Time	A.M.
Clas	✓
Cat	✓
Bk. Card	✓
Checked	Ans



PREFACE.

THE following Letters, written during the Summer of 1815, for the information of a young friend, who had recently received an appointment in the East India Company's service, were intended to prevent his imbibing prejudices, as unjust as they are illiberal, against a race of people, eminent for their piety and morality:—prejudices which seem to have arisen from a total ignorance of Oriental Chronology, and a confined knowledge of the religion of the Vedas. But it having been suggested to the Author, that the giving publicity to a system of Chronology, varying in all its parts from that hitherto admitted by Europeans, might assist the ministers of our Church, in the pious and arduous task of removing prejudices, which are supposed to have retarded the progress of Christianity in Hindustan, these Letters are sub-

mitted to the public with the hope, that the motive, which induces their publication, will be received as an apology for the inaccuracies they may contain. With a view to render the subject less intricate to those who are unaccustomed to Hindu history, an explanatory Glossary is affixed, which will in some degree rectify those typical errors, which occur in consequence of the unavoidable absence of the Author, when the Letters were in the press.

The impediments which have hitherto retarded the progress of Christianity among the Brahmans, appear to have arisen rather from the intolerance with which it has been enforced, and the prejudices of those who have endeavoured to enforce it, than from any religious prejudices on the part of the Hindus. Those who will take the trouble to examine the History of their religion, will easily trace the pure worship of an almighty, just, and merciful God, in all their sacred Puranas. The prejudices of the Brahmans are political rather than religious, and attach wholly to Casts. For, although tenacious of their own doctrine, they never endeavour to convert others to their faith; concluding that as, in their original purity, all

religions were from God, they must necessarily be equally acceptable to him; and that, provided the faith in that God is pure and holy, the form, in which he is adored, must be immaterial. Consequently, they neither despise nor condemn those who differ in religious opinions, but suppose them to be, equally with themselves, under the protection of that benevolent God, who is never unmindful of those, who offer up their prayers with purity of heart; firmly believing, that "the power that stooped to soften human woes, none e'er implored in vain." The priests of a religion so tolerant, cannot justly be deemed prejudiced; nor can prejudices (if such they are deemed), so favourable to religion, be considered as obstacles to reformation: it must then be supposed, that it is not the prejudices of the Brahmans, but the prejudices of Europeans, that have impeded the progress of Christianity in Asia; and, if the mode hitherto adopted be examined with candour, it will appear, that, until within a very few years, the orthodox ministers of our Church have made no efforts on the subject; and that the Missionaries, unacquainted both with the chronology and religion of the Hindus, have endeavoured to over-

throw the religion of the living God, instead of withdrawing the veil by which it is obscured. On the one hand, the Roman Missionaries, while they prostrated themselves before the images of their saints, showered forth anathemas against the Hindus, as Idolaters; and, on the other, a people who had been taught, from the earliest ages of the world, to consider morality as the means by which the favour of the Almighty was infallibly to be obtained, were told, that to believe in the incarnation of Christ was alone necessary to salvation; but happily a period has arrived, when the eyes of the Brahmans will be opened to the Christian religion, in its purest form; they will hear the religion of Christ expounded without either superstition or bigotry, and be enabled to become proselytes thereto, without apostatizing from that of the God they adore.

Some years ago, on a young Brahman having been converted to Christianity, by a Danish Missionary, his father exclaimed, "Alas! he was ignorant of his own religion:" and thus mildly admonished him: "My son, thou art yet too young to be acquainted with the mysteries of our

sacred religion ; we do not worship many gods in the extravagant manner you are led to suppose. In a multitude of images we adore *one* divine Essence *only*. Thou shouldest have applied for information to the learned sacerdotal Brahmins of our nation, who would have enlightened thy mind ; and, by removing thy doubts, would have prevented thy dereliction of the holy religion of thy forefathers."

Bernier, who was a very judicious observer of Hindu manners, and who enquired of the Pundits of Benares, why they admitted images in their temples, received their answer, as follows : "*Elles sont dans nos deuras (temples) afin qu'il y ait quelque chose devant les yeux, qui arrête l'esprit ; et quand nous prions ce n'est pas la statue que nous prions, mais celui qui est représenté par la statue ; au reste nous reconnoissons que c'est Dieu qui est le maître absolu et le seul tout-puissant.*" When M. Ziegenbaly, one of the Missionaries sent by the king of Denmark, when Tanjore was ceded to the Danes, in the year 1621, required, in writing, from a variety of Brahmins, the reason of their adopting images

instead of directing their adoration to the Supreme Being, he uniformly received for answer, "that God, being spiritual, and without shape, was incomprehensible, and as no precise idea could be formed of him, adoration *before* idols was permitted by their religion, and would be received by the Eternal as adoration to himself."

The secretary of Akbar, who had every means of gaining information from the Brahmins, affirms, that they, one and all, believe in the unity of the Godhead; and that, although they held images in high veneration yet that they were by no means idolaters, as the ignorant supposed, images being only representations of celestial beings, to whom they turn, whilst at prayer, to prevent their thoughts from wandering; adding that God may be adored in the heart, in the sun, in fire, in water or earth, or in the form of an idol. But, after all, the Hindu Scriptures are the best authority; and it is recorded in the Manava Sastra, that "the divine Spirit *alone* is the whole assemblage of Gods, that men are permitted to worship that Spirit in any of his works, provided they consider the *supreme omnipotent intelligence* as the sovereign Lord of them all: that *Spirit*, being by

no means the object of any sense, can only be conceived by a mind wholly abstracted from matter; therefore, for the *purpose of assisting* his meditation, man may imagine it more subtile than the finest conceivable essence, and more bright than the purest gold. *He* is, therefore, by some, adored as transcendently present in elementary fire; by others, as Menu, Lord of Creatures; by some, as more distinctly present in Indra, Regent of the clouds and the atmosphere; by others, as pure air; and by some, as the *most high eternal Spirit.*"

No orthodox Brahman can be an idolater: there may be sectaries, who secede from the established faith, as there are among Christians. But, to give effect to the Gospel in Asia, the ministers of Christ, in lieu of combating an opinion originating in mistaken zeal and prejudices, should, by comparing the religion of the Vedas in its pristine purity, with the sublimest doctrine of true religion, incline the natives of Hindustan to reject the impurities that have clouded the religion of their ancestors; and then, by shewing them that the religion of Christ is founded on that promul-

gated by the Eternal Spirit they adore, draw them by imperceptible degrees, to become enamoured of a faith, which cannot exist without morality, and which contains the sublime doctrine of their sacred records, divested of those errors by which it is at present clouded. With a view of furthering this desirable object, a Key to their Chronology is now offered; which, being extracted from their most ancient and most sacred institutes, no orthodox Brahman can object to; and chronology is so far necessary to religion, that without dates it is difficult, if not impossible, to stamp authenticity on history, whether sacred or profane. For when, apparently, the same event is placed by different nations at epochs the most remote from each other, or when different persons of the same nation, appear to place the birth of the same person in different periods of the world, it is a natural inference that one or all of the narrations are unfounded. If, therefore, by an analysis of Hindu chronology, the protracted numbers, which have so generally been pronounced astronomical periods, are proved to correspond with the dates given in the Hebrew text of our Bible, one great object is obtained. For the con-

traditions that appear in the chronology of the ancients, having ever been resorted to as an argument against religion, by the sceptics of every nation, this shelter for infidelity is removed, if it can be proved, to mathematical demonstration, that the Hindus, Egyptians, Chaldeans, and Chinese, equally with the Hebrews, place the creation of the world at a period not exceeding 5820 years from the present time; and that each nation allows 1656 years from that memorable event to the awful visitation of the Almighty, when, with the exception of one family, all mankind were destroyed by a general deluge. And if such an analysis produce proof that the reigns of the gods recorded in the Old Chronicle, together with the fourteen first dynasties of Egyptian kings, as given by Manethon; the fourteen Menus of the Hindus, the Chaldean dynasties of Berosus, and the eight first reigns of the Chinese, all agree in point of date with the Hebrew text of our Bible, it establishes the superiority of that text over those of the Septuagint and Samaritan: a subject of some importance, since nothing has been more prejudicial to the furtherance of Christianity with learned men in Asia, than the different opinions

maintained by Europeans relative to the chronology of their Scriptures, and the avidity with which authors turn from the one text to the other as they respectively assist a favourite hypothesis. Another circumstance very likely to promote Christianity in Asia will arise from comparing the four great Indian prophets, figuratively termed the "Mouths of God," with the first four Hebrew prophets; and proving, from an analysis of their chronology, that Swayambhuva, the first of men, termed Buddha, the son of the Self-existing, was created in the same year with Adam; and that Buddha the son of Máya, Buddha the son of Jina, and Buddha the son of Devace, were respectively born in the same years with the Hebrew prophets, Enoch, Noah, and Moses; for it is consonant to reason that a race of men eminently pious, and tenacious of the divine origin of their religion, should be gratified in finding that Europeans, equally with themselves, believe the will of God to have been promulgated by those persons, whom they figuratively term the "Mouths of God." Hitherto their great luminary Buddha, the son of Máya, whom one sect worship as an incarnation of the Deity, from his having been exempt from

death, hath been represented by Europeans as an impostor, and much pains have been taken to establish his identity with Foe, a Chinese atheist, who, in his dying moments, denied the existence of pure spirit. The time is arrived when the natives of India shall learn from the orthodox ministers of our Church (by identifying their prophet with Enoch, the son of Jared), that every Christian considers him as a type of that blessed Spirit, to whose religion they are desirous of converting them. It must be obvious to every unprejudiced mind, that the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts will be furthered in proportion to the tolerance with which it is recommended, and that we should always endeavour to convince others, that while we contend for the purity of our own religion, considering it a peculiar revelation from God, we by no means deny the divine origin of theirs. In lieu then of condemning the religion, and ridiculing the prophets of the Hindus, if we would convert them to Christianity, we should compare their religion and their prophets with our own. How gratifying to a Brahman must it be to read in our Scriptures, that Buddha, the son of Devace, under the

Hebrew appellation of Moses, recorded that their divine Buddha, under the name of Enoch, "walked with God," and was translated to Heaven in the eighty-eighth year of the Cali age. That Solomon, the wisest of men, attributed the shortness of the prophet's duration on earth to his piety, recording, that "he pleased God, and was beloved by him, so that, living amongst sinners, he was translated, lest wickedness should alter his understanding, or deceit beguile his soul:" that the son of Sirac quoted their prophet as "an example of repentance to all men;" for "upon earth was no man created like Enoch, who was taken from the earth." These passages, as confirmed by the Apostles of Christ, if properly explained, cannot fail of producing, in so tolerant a race as the Hindus, impressions favourable to our religion. The great Apostle of the Gentiles, who became all things to all men, in hopes of gaining some to the religion of Christ, adopted this mode, when he drew the attention of the early proselytes to the virtues of the elders of the old world. St. Paul neither condemned the religion of the Jew, nor of the Gentile; but exhorted them to turn from the abominations by which they had defiled it,

and to be filled with faith, as their prophets were of old; therefore said he, "By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God." And the example of this great Apostle may justify the adoption of a similar conduct in the Protestant ministers of the present day, who will gain more proselytes by enforcing the doctrine of faith, according to the definition here given by St. Paul, than by any other means; for every Brahman believes "that without faith it is impossible to please God; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is; and that he is a Rewarder of them that diligently seek him." St. Jude did not despise the doctrine of the Hindu prophet, when he spake of the revelations of Enoch, as a book of undoubted authority in his time, describing its author as the seventh from Adam. "Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of those things, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his angels, to execute judgment on all." What is so likely to impress the Brahmans with favourable sentiments of our religion, as a knowledge that their prophet, the seventh from Swayambhuva (the first-created),

was quoted as an example of piety and faith, by the Apostles of the Church, of which they are invited to become members? The experiment is at least well worth the trial; for if it doth not remove, it cannot create, prejudices unfavourable to Christianity, in the minds of the Hindus.

The Chronology itself, and the Analysis thereof, being extracted from the most ancient and sacred Institutes of the Brahmans, must be correct, although the application of it, in some instances, may be erroneous. That the Buddhas of the Hindus were the prophets of the Hebrews is proved by the time of their birth, the events of their lives, and the periods of their deaths. That the Menus recorded by the Hindus were the antediluvian patriarchs, recorded by Moses, is established by the commencement of the Antara of the first Menu, corresponding in date with the creation of Adam; and that of the last, who was saved in a miraculous ark, corresponding with that of Noah, is also corroborated by considering that the Antara of the Menus, collectively, average 857 years and a fraction; and that the aggregate of the respective lives of the patriarchs in the race of


Seth, according to the Hebrew text, is 8575 years; which number, divided by ten, will give, on an average, 857 years and a fraction, for the life of each of them. That the dynasties of the Sun and Moon were antediluvian is clear; because it is ascertained that they were established in the beginning of the fifth century of the world: and that they descended from Seth and Cain is implied, because it is recorded, that they sprung from two distinguished sons of the first-created. The division of these dynasties may nevertheless be subject to some inaccuracy, since it is the principals only that are accurately described. The minor branches, who, like the Nomi in Egypt, assisted in the government, are placed from memory, after the author had been deprived of the originals from which they were extracted. This, however, is not essential to the general object of the work, since such inaccuracies may easily be rectified by those who have an opportunity of referring to the Puranas from which they were taken.

If these observations, the result of a long and intimate knowledge of the character, religion, and manners of the Hindus, should become instrumen-

tal in converting them to Christianity, the great object of their publication will be fulfilled; and if not, the information contained in the following **Letters** may at least afford amusement and instruction to the young student in his researches after literary knowledge. In the works of Origen and others, who profess to believe in the creation and destruction of worlds innumerable, alledging that such revolutions ever had existed, and ever would exist, he will recognize the Menwantara system of the Hindus, or annual renewal of time, when nature becomes regenerate at the vernal equinox; when "*He*, whose property it is to exist unperceived by sense, having long reposed (during the winter), awakes, and, awaking, reproduces the great principle of animation." He will, by fully comprehending the early dynasties of the Hindus, Egyptians, and Chaldeans, recognize in each the antediluvian patriarchs, as recorded in the Hebrew text of his Bible; and by a coincidence of dates and events, he will obtain collateral proofs of the authority of that holy record, upon which he justly grounds his faith in Christ; and from the sublime doctrines of true religion which he finds in their sacred records, he will learn with the Hindn, to

tolerate all religious opinions which are founded on the worship of the living God. He will "be enabled to establish as indubitable, that the three first ages of the Hindus are *not* mythological:" that they are neither "founded on the enigmas of their Astronomers, nor on the heroic fictions of their Poets; but that they contain a period of nine hundred years only;" "that the fourth historical age *can* be carried further back *than about two thousand years before Christ,*" and that the commencement of it is correctly placed at Y. B. C. 3182; since, by adding nine hundred years to the current year of the fourth of Cali age, we get the true epoch of the creation, according to all oriental chronology. And when he reflects that a period of time not exceeding that of one annual revolution of the Sun, hath been compared to the doctrine of Archytas, the numerator of the sands, and deemed sufficient to baffle the ingenuity of Archimedes, who invented a notation that was capable of expressing them, their chronology being deemed "an absurdity so monstrous as to overthrow their whole system, so technical an arrangement *excluding the idea of serious history;*" and when he calls to mind that "nothing

has so embarrassed the learned world, as the dynasties of the kings of Egypt," and recollects that a learned Commentator of his own time doubts "whether it be in the power of man to thoroughly regulate the Egyptian chronology," and then finds himself enabled, by a simple rule in common arithmetic, to solve all such difficulties, he will be convinced of the folly and impiety of those who, suffering prejudice to get the better of their understanding, refuse their assent, whether in chronology or religion, to that which they do not fully comprehend. He will thereby learn to have "faith in things not seen," and to believe in those great truths, which may at present appear mysterious to him, in the holy religion of Christ.



LETTER I.

MY DEAR SIR,

IN compliance with your request, I have arranged the observations, which a long residence in India enabled me to make, on the Theology and Chronology of the Hindus: subjects little understood, but which every young man, who enters into the East India Company's service, should endeavour to become master of; more especially since the conversion of the Hindus to Christianity has become a consideration with the English Government, and which may, I am confident, be effected with ease, if proper methods are adopted. On this subject I speak from personal knowledge, having devoted much time to so desirable an object: and had it not interfered with the mercenary views of an individual, the protestant religion had long since been introduced not only in the district of Dindigul, but in all the Polloms subordinate thereto. I shall be most happy, if my researches prove either beneficial or amusing to you. They may possibly prevent you from imbibing those

great Buddhas (prophets) correspond in point of date with those of Adam, Enoch, Noah, and Moses, of the Hebrew Scripture, smiles with contempt at those Europeans who attempt to regulate Chronology, by rejecting that of their established church for the Septuagint or Samaritan text: Those who attempt to convert the Brahmans to Christianity must recollect, that there is scarcely any Christian virtue, which was not enjoined by their great Buddha nearly five thousand years ago; and handed down to the present day. If, then, we wish to convince them, that an incarnation of the Deity took place 1814 years ago; or in the Cali year 3102, we must divest ourselves of that intolerant spirit, with which sarcasms have been thrown against their religion, their morality, and their chronology. One author tells us, "that if a Sooda should get by heart, nay even if he should read or listen to the sacred books, the law condemns him to a most cruel death." Whereas, from a conviction that the Vedas are too abstruse for the generality of the people, a body of laws named Smartya were composed, consisting of 18 books divided under the heads of the duty of religion, of justice, and of the punishment, or expiation of crimes*. These were compiled for

* This code is formed from the ordinances of Menu the son of

the information of mankind in general ; but for the further information of the lower casts in religious knowledge, the Pasupata and Pancharatra, with innumerable other works, were composed. The study of the Veda is enjoined to the three first casts ; and the study of the latter works to the fourth, to whom, from their subordinate stations, and want of erudition, the Vedas were unintelligible. Thus an institution, wisely and humanely ordained to make religious knowledge general, is represented as a crime of the first magnitude. Mr. Halhed might have recollected that the Christians of the Latin Church are forbidden to read the Scriptures, and that the service is performed in a language which the lower classes are totally ignorant of: he must have known, that the lower classes of the Hindus are totally unacquainted with the Sanscrit language, in which the Vedas are written ; and he ought to have known, that the Sanscrit, in which they are written, particularly the first Veda, is so obsolete, as to be

of Brahma, translated by Sir W. Jones from the gloss of Cullūca Bhatta. In the Manava Smṛiti we read that " the Scripture " is an eye giving constant light: nor could the Veda Smṛiti have been made by human faculties, nor can it be measured by " human reason unassisted by revered glosses and comments: " he who completely knows the sense of the Veda Smṛiti while " he remains in any of the four orders approaches the divine " nature while he remains on this world."

illegible to many of the learned Brahmins, and that, in consequence thereof, it is the Veda of Vedas, so called from being compiled from the three divine Vedas, that is generally read.

The Hindu sects are so numerous, and the four original casts* so divided, and subdivided, since they were first instituted, that an attempt to explain them would be as visionary as useless; they are all branches from one great root, originally instituted for the purpose of establishing morality, subordination and good government, among the people in general. For the religion of the Hindus, although now clouded by fable, was not so originally and the Puranas, or Sacred legends, however monstrous they may appear to the eye of prejudice, are either religious symbols, or allegorical descriptions of past events.

The Hindus believe in one great primeval Cause, the Deity; whom, under whatever name adored, they suppose to have existed from all eternity, and who, (to prevent the profanation annexed to the pronouncing of his name) is usually described as the Self-existing. This great first Cause, is worshipped as universal, supreme, and infinite; is considered as a divine essence, incom-

* The Brahman, the Cshatriya, the Vaitya and the Súdra.

prehensible and immutable, which fills all space and is the primary cause of all things. To attempt, even in thought, to personify this divine essence, is in their scripture regarded as profane. Neither are the mystic characters, which are used to denote the Deity, permitted to be pronounced aloud, or the lips to move, although the word should be pronounced mentally a thousand times a day. The following may be considered as the articles of the Hindu faith: That the Eternal is ONE, the creator of all things both in heaven and on earth, and in the waters beneath; that he resembles a perfect sphere, without beginning and without end; that the Eternal rules and governs all creation by a general providence, resulting from first determined and fixed principles. "Thou shalt not make enquiry into the essence of the eternal ONE, neither by what laws he governs; an enquiry into either is as vain as criminal. It is enough, that day by day, and night by night, thou perceivest in his works, his wisdom, his power, and his mercy. Benefit thereby." Brahma is considered as the spirit, who emanated from this eternal essence, for the creation of the world. But, since idolatry has been introduced among the Hindus, the three attributes of the one living God have been worshipped separately under the titles of Siva, Vishnu and Brahma. To the latter no

temples are dedicated, but the worship of the Lingam is exclusively to him.—At present, the Hindus, to whatever minor cast they may belong, are divided into two sects, the followers of Siva, and the followers of Vishnu. The first date their origin as coeval with the creation ; the second, from the first incarnation of Vishnu, erroneously stated by Europeans at the deluge : for the learned Hindus invariably believe that all the Avatars were antediluvian ; the belief of the generality of the natives is, that the Eternal emitted three sparks, which they personify by the three gods, Siva, Vishnu, and Brahma. The church Brahmins consider Siva as the symbol of the supreme God ; Vishnu as the primordial spirit, that first moved on the waters, the God who existed before all worlds, who redeemed mankind from sin, and who will re-appear in a carnal form at the day of judgement ; Brahma as the creative attribute (Viraj) by whom were produced Swayambhuva and Satarupa, the general parents of mankind.

The Deity is still worshipped in Trinity, under the name of Trimouti or Tritoum : that is, the Hindus acknowledge three attributes of one God ; thereby denoting his omnipotence, his providence, and his justice ; offering up their prayers and thanksgiving to the preserving and destroying

attributes of the Eternal. • But the classical Brahmins, particularly those of the Vidanta school, consider the holy Triad in a ^{more}recondite sense, as three Gods in one God ; not as Brahma, Siva and Vishna, but as one pervading Spirit ; The eternal Spirit in heaven, the eternal Spirit on earth. To personify either, even in idea, is considered profane. The third person in their holy Triad is the same divine Spirit, in an incarnate form : this is one of the most ancient tenets of their religion, taught by their incarnate God, during the first millenary of the world, and corresponds with that taught by Enoch, the great Hebrew prophet, at the same period. There are several pagodas, or temples, sacred to this worship, in one of which the symbol of the Deity is a man with three heads : and at the great pagoda of Travancore, the symbol is a serpent with a thousand heads : the great feast of Anandavourda, held annually on the eve of the full moon in October, when the year originally commenced, is in honour of the Trimouti, and is attended by thousands of the natives of every cast, who assemble from every part of the country.

There are numerous temples dedicated to Siva, and to Vishnu ; at each of which Brahman ministers, initiated in the peculiar mysteries of either sect, officiate. But to Brahma, as not being immortal, no temples are erected ; although the Hindus

of either sect pay him daily adoration, as the creative attribute, in their private prayers.

Siva is worshipped as supreme and eternal justice, who at the end of the world, will distribute rewards and punishments: Vishna as the mediator and preserver, who left his paradise in heaven, and became incarnate, to deprecate the wrath of the Eternal. In this incarnation, he is believed to have animated the body of Parasa Rama, the great Buddha, the son of Máyá, or divine delusion.

They reckon ten principal Avataras; of which that which has been mentioned, is the only incarnation of the Deity that is past: the remaining eight being considered as partaking of a portion only of the Deity. The tenth is expected at the close of the Cali age, as an incarnation of the same divine redeeming Spirit, who will return in great glory to judge mankind, previously to the final distribution of rewards and punishments by the Supreme.

The chronology of the Hindus has been variously represented; some rejecting their numbers altogether as visionary; and others considering them merely as astronomical observations. If either of these hypotheses is admitted, and each of them has been given as an axiom, no data can ever be obtained, from which to place the Avataras; all of which except the tenth, which is still to come, are antecedent to the deluge, Buddha of the ninth

Avatara being the prince saved in the ark. Europeans, on the contrary, from the Matsya or fish Avatar being the first, suppose* all the succeeding to be postdiluvian, mistaking the first Avatar when the deluge was foretold by Buddha, the son of Máya their incarnate God for the ninth, when the prophecy was fulfilled in the person of Vaivaswat; and so bigotted are some to this postdiluvian system, that they do not hesitate to pronounce the Brahmans strangely inconsistent for not giving up the whole chronology of their country, and changing the epoch, when the Cali or present age commenced, in conformity to the erroneous calculations of Romish missionaries and Chinese Bouzes*.

To understand the Hindu chronology, it is absolutely necessary to be perfectly acquainted with the different divisions of time, as recorded in the institutes of Menu. It will then clearly appear, that those numbers which have of late years been injudiciously pronounced astronomical cycles, or periods, are nothing more than the different powers of numbers multiplied into each other. The Brahmans profess, and the unenlightened Hindus believe that the world was created to last 4320000 years, as follows.

* Maurice, vol. II. 562. 9th edit.

1st age or*	Critajugen.....	1728000
2d age	Tritajugen.....	1296000
3d age	Dwaparajugen...	864000
4th age	Calijugen.....	<u>432000</u>

Making an aggregate of 4320000 years.

These numbers indicate nothing more than the subdivisions of time, or matires, equal to the two hundred and fortieth part of an Indian minute, compared to the twinkling of an eye, which the following table will more fully explain†.

TABLE I.

Matire

2 Matires	= 1 Chiperon.
10 Chiperons	= 1 Chinon.
12 Chinons	= 1 Venidique, or one Indian minute.
60 Venidiques	= 1 Naigue.
7½ Naigues	= 1 Saman.
8 Samans	= 1 Day.
15 Days	= 1 Parouvan.
2 Parouvans	= 1 Month.
12 Months	= 1 Year.
100 Years	= the life of man.

These years being formed of 12 months consisting of 30 days each, are multiplied by 360 so

* This age, when represented as the age of Virtue, is termed Crita; when as the first age, Satya.

† Ten Matires are equal to one English second, an English minute containing 600 matires.

as to ~~comprehend~~ = 36000 days. This was the great *Sapos*, or 100 years of the Chaldeans.

$36000 \times 6 = 216000$, is a multiplication which they profess to be in honour of the six subdivisions of a day, from Matires to Samans; and this number 216000 may be considered as the basis of their calculations.

216000 they multiply by 2, to commemorate the period when the virtues and vices of mankind were equal: the return of the race of Atri or Cain.

$216000 \times 2 = 432000$ the Calijug, or age of Sin, the fourth age.

216000 they multiply by 4, to commemorate the Vedas.

$216000 \times 4 = 864000$ the Dwaparajug, or third age.

216000 they multiply by 6, to commemorate the Vedas and Sasters.

$216000 \times 6 = 1296000$ the Tritajug, or second age.

216000 they multiply by 8 to commemorate the corners of the world*.

* "In his hands are all the corners of the earth." Ps. xciv.
4.—According to the Hindu mythology, the eight Patriarchs of the antediluvian world became benign spirits and guardians of mankind, one of them presiding over each of the eight corners of

$216000 \times 8 = 1728000$ the Critijug, or first age.

The four ages added together form a period of time called Sadrijug or Sadrijugan, amounting to 4320000 years, or a divine age.

Two Sadrijugans make one day and night of Brahma, who is supposed to have created the world by the express order of the Eternal, during the first Sadrijugan or day, and to have retired to rest during the second, or night; during which period the world will gradually decay; when Brahma, awaking, renews creation, and so on until the end of time.

8640000 years are equal to 2 Sadrijugans; and form one day of Brahma of 24 hours; 30 such days, or 60 Sadrijugans make one of his months; 12 such months one of his years; and 100 such years, his life; as follows:

8640000 = 1 day and night.

259200000 = 1 month.

3110400000 = 1 year.

311040000000 = the life of Brahma.

of the world. These are termed Elephants to distinguish them from the race of Atris; the same with the Dæmons of Plato who lived in the time of Cronus, who reigned during the Golden Age; and whom Hesiod describes as Dæmons or benign spirits, who after death resided within the verge of the earth as guardians of mankind.

or $8640000 \times 30 \times 12 \times 100 = 31104000000 =$
1000 years.

From these numbers a cypher is formed, in which all antediluvian records are kept: and, as in comparing the several Asiatic dates with those of the Hebrews, we shall frequently have to refer to this table, I have formed therefrom two others, the second, by multiplying the subdivisions into each other agreeably to the Hindu mode, and the third by multiplying agreeably to the mode in use amongst Europeans.

TABLE II.

Matres	$1 \times 2 = 2,$	or one Chiperon.
	$2 \times 10 = 20,$	or one Chinon.
	$20 \times 12 = 240,$	or one Venidique, a minute.
	$240 \times 60 = 14400,$	or one Naigue = 3600 seconds.
	$14400 \times 7\frac{1}{4} = 108000,$	or one Saman, or three hours.
	$108000 \times 4 = 432000,$	or one Saman of 12 hours or day, the Calijugan.
	$432000 \times 2 = 864000,$	or one day of 24 hours day and night, the Dwaparajugan.
	$864000 \times 15 = 12960000,$	or a Parouvan, i. e. 15 days, the Tritajugan.
	$12960000 \times 2 = 25920000,$	or a Month of 30 days.
	$25920000 \times 12 = 311040000,$	or a Year of 360 days.
	$311040000 \times 360 = 111974400000.$	

The latter number is seldom, if ever, introduced in the Hindu cypher.

Year of 360 days.

Month of 30 days.

Parouvan or light $\frac{1}{4}$ of the moon's days.

Day of 24 hours.

Saman of 12 hours or 1 day.

Saman, or three hours.

Naigues.

Venidiques, i.e. minutes.

Chinons.

Chiperons.

Matires.

* A prophetic Manwantara.

The Hindus have several modes of expressing time : A Menwantara is 71 divine ages, or 4320000
 $\times 171 = 206720000$. It is given as follows :

“ Eighteen Nimeshas, or twinklings of an eye, are one Casht’ha ; thirty Casht’has one Cala ; thirty Calas one Mahurta ; and just so many Mahurtas let mankind consider as the duration of their day and night.”

“ The Sun causes the distribution of day and night, both divine and human ; night being intended for the repose of various beings, and day for their exertion.”

“ A month of mortals is a day and night of the Pitris, or Patriarchs, inhabiting the Moon ; and the division of a month being into equal halves, the half beginning with the full moon is their day for action, and that beginning with the new moon is their night for slumber.”

“ A year of mortals is a day and night of the Gods, or regents of the universe, situated round the north pole : and again their division is this ; their day is the northern, and their night the southern course of the Sun.”

“ Learn now the division of a day and night of Brahma, and of the several ages that shall be mentioned in order succinctly.”

“ Sages have given the name of Crita to an age, containing four thousand years of the Gods ;

the twilight preceding it consists of as many hundred, and the twilight following it of the same number."

"In the other three ages, with their twilight preceding and following, are thousands and hundreds diminished by one."

"The divine years in the four human ages just enumerated, being added together, their sum, or twelve thousand, is called the age of the Gods."

"And by reckoning a thousand such divine ages, a day of Brahma may be known; his night has also an equal duration." Again,

"The before-mentioned age of the Gods, or twelve thousand of their years, being multiplied by seventy-one, constitutes what is here named a Menwantara, or the time, Antara, of a Menu."

"There are numberless Menwantaras; creations ~~also~~ and destructions of worlds innumerable: the Being supremely exalted performs all this with as much ease as if in sport; again and again, for the sake of conferring happiness*."

It is necessary to explain this mode of reckoning, previously to the application of it. In the preceding table it appears that the Calijug, the fourth age, or 432000 years answers to one half day, or 12 hours; consequently the aggregate of the

* Vide Institutes of Menu, ch. 1.

ages of 432000 years, 12000 years of the Gods, is equal to ten days of 12 hours, or to five whole days. Thus one divine age, or 12000 years is symbolical of five days of 24 hours; and these days multiplied by 71 give 355, or one Savan year. So that a Menwantara, or 71 divine ages, the apparently prolonged period of 306720000 years, denotes one year only; being nothing more than the number of Matires contained in a Savan year.—The Hindus have a variety of years, all of which agree with those of the ancient Jews*. The Hindu Savan year corresponds in point of duration with the Lunar year of the Jews. It consists of 355 days, which is the number of times the Sun rises above the horizon during its progress through the ecliptic. On this year their cypher is formed. There are, however, several others consisting of 357 and 360 days. In one of the Vedas, time is divided as follows :

18 Nimeshas = 1 Casht'ha.

30 Casht'has = 1 Cala.

30 Calas = 1 Mahurta.

30 Mahurtas = 1 day of 24 hours,

which multiplied into each other, give 486000. But as that number of Nimeshas † is equal to 864000

* Vide Appendix (C).

† A Casht'ha = 32 Matires or 8 Indian seconds = $3'' \frac{1}{2}$ European.
A Cala

Matires, it makes no alteration in the calculation of the Menwantara; which is, and ever was, symbolical of one year, or of the renewal of Creation at the return of the vernal equinox.

The life of Brahma comes next to be explained. But we must not confound Brahma with Brahm, or the Eternal; for, according to the mythology of the Hindus, the great power emitted a spark of his divine essence, or Brahma, for the express purpose of creation, saying: "Go, bid all worlds exist;" and the duration of his life is limited to that of the Creation, which he formed, as will be more fully explained by the following table.

TABLE IV.

	Twilight A. M.	Ages.	Twilight P. M.	Divine ages.	Mortal years.
Crita	400	4000	400	4800	1728000
Trêtâ	300	3000	300	3600	1296000
Dwapara	200	2000	200	2400	864000
Cali.	100	1000	100	1200	432000
	<u>1000</u>	<u>10000</u>	<u>1000</u>	<u>12000</u>	<u>4320000 ÷</u>
	360 = 12000.				

The foregoing tables prove that the aggregate

A Cala	= 960	Matires or 4 Indian minutes	= 1' 36".
A Mahurta	= 28800	or 2 Naigues	= 48'.
30 Mahurtas	= 864000	or 8 Samans	= 24 h.

14939

14.9.39



of 4320000 years of mortals, or a divine age, is in fact so many Matires, or five days of twenty-four hours. For as 432000 Matires denote one day of 12 hours, so must 4320000 denote ten days of 12 hours, or five of 24 hours*. And as a thousand Sadrijugans are a day of Brahma †, so does that day contain five thousand days of 24 hours. St. Peter says, "Beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." 2 Pet. iii. 8. This is the Maha or great day of Brahma, his usual day being a period, or a thousand years, and our text goes on to say, "his night is of the same duration." So that the 10000 years in the second column of the fourth Table, are the two thousand Sadrijugans, or day and night of Brahma: The first column, or morning twilight, represents the four ages, as will be presently explained; the evening twilight denotes a period of time very similar to that which is connected with the ancient belief of a millennium. This period the Hindus divide, supposing that during the first five hundred years, Narayana, or Vishnu, the spirit that moved on the waters at the creation, and became incarnate soon after the fall of man, will return and sojourn on earth, with the Ree-Shees (saints,) and Buddhas (pro-

* Table III.

† Table I

phets,) for the purpose of judging all departed souls, preparatory to the final d  cr  e of the Almighty, which will occupy the remaining five hundred years. The Hindus express it as a period of time equal in duration to the last age of the world, which the above table states at one thousand years. Here you will observe the great similitude between the opinion of the Hindus and that of the primitive Christians, as well as the ancient Jews, who professed that the world was created to last 6000 years; that these periods of 1000 years were represented by the six days of the week; with God, one day being as a thousand years; and that the seventh day was a thousand years of peace; which some authors consider as elucidatory of 500 years before the law was given; and of 500 years before the temple was completed: The fourth table is very comprehensive. The first column explains the duration of the ages, as they return in every thousand years; the second, the great day of Brahma, or 2000 Sadrijugans; the third, the Millennium; and the fourth and fifth, the aggregate of the whole, or the period during which Satan will have influence over the world. For of the 4320000 days, or 12000 years, Brahma sleeps one half: consequently the period which the Jews assigned for the duration of the world, or six thousand years, coincides with that of the Hindus.

The ^{en}igma then is solved. The human ages are represented in Matires, and the divine one in days : For

$$1728000 \div 4800 = 360$$

$$1296000 \div 3600 = 360$$

$$864000 \div 2400 = 360$$

$$432000 \div 1200 = 360.$$

Yet although each age in one sense, denotes a time or 360 days, the aggregate of the four human ages or Matires 4320000, are, in the general cypher, considered but as five days of twenty-four hours.

For

Matires.	Hours.	Days.
1728000	= 48	= 2
1296000	= 36	= 1½
864000	= 24	= 1
432000	= 12	= 0½
<hr/> Total 4320000	<hr/> 120	<hr/> 5

And 5 days are to 4320000 Matires as 360 days are to 1855200000, which is half the year of Brahma. And Men^{us} explains a year of mortals to be a day and night of the Gods, or regents of the universe ; their day being the northern, and their night the southern course of the Sun. But the divine age has a more recondite meaning, and, when it is used as an historic date, it always denotes one year. For a divine age is considered as the duration of a time (erroneously rendered the duration of the

world) at the expiration of which nature becomes regenerate at the vernal equinox : on which account, it is said " there are numberless Menwantaras, and creations also." In this sense the prophet Daniel denotes 360 days by " a time ;" and as seventy-one divine ages form a Menwantara, so does a Menwantara denote, when applied to dates, seventy-one years.

The present year being the Cali year 4917, answers to the year of the world 5817. For as the three first ages comprised 3888000 suppositious years equal to nine hundred ; so does $900 + 4917 = 5817$, or the three first ages and the portion of the fourth that is past : which admitting the Hindus to be correct in placing the Christian era at A. M. 4002, answers to the year of Christ 1815, and places us in the end of the sixth or last Calpa of Brahma.

The name of Sir William Jones is sufficient to carry conviction, without enquiry. To his researches the world are indebted for vast funds of Hindu knowledge, and his memory must ever be revered by the lovers of Asiatic literature. Yet no one was more easily deceived respecting chronology, or less tolerant when treating thereof. In the 345th page of the third volume of his works, we read " that the aggregate of the four first ages constitutes the extravagant sum of four millions three hundred and twenty thousand years ; which

aggregate multiplied by seventy-one is the period in which every Menu is believed to preside over the world. Such a period one might conceive would have satisfied Archytas, the measurer of the sea and earth, and the numberer of the sands ; or Archimedes, who invented a notation that was capable of expressing the number of them ; but the comprehensive mind of an Indian chronologer has no limits, and the reigns of fourteen Menus, are only a single day of Brahma ; fifty of which days have already elapsed, according to the Hindus, from the time of the creation. All this puerility may be an astronomical riddle, alluding to the apparent revolutions of the fixed stars, of which the Brahmans make a mystery, but so technical an arrangement excludes all idea of serious history."

The foregoing tables demonstrate that we are now towards the end of the sixth day of Brahma, for as one thousand years are as one day, so must 5817 be nearly the close of the sixth. An Hindu would say, that, as we have entered into the 4917th year of the Cali age, five Calpas, eleven Menwantaras, thirty-five divine ages, three human ages, and four thousand and nine hundred and fourteen years of the fourth age of the twelfth Menwantara are passed.

	Years.
The five Calpas or days being	5000
The eleven Menwantaras, or $11 \times 71 = \dots$	781
The thirty-five divine ages so many years .	35
Total completed years	<u>5816</u>

Sir William Jones is mistaken in stating the reigns of fourteen Menus as one day of Brahma : thirty years are added to the sum of the fourteen Menwantaras that constitute the reign of the Menus ; those Menwantaras being of Savan years. Sir William probably calculated on that of the Surya Sidhanta, which was altered by Meya to 308448000, or a year of 357 days ; $357 \times 14 = 4998$, which corresponds with the Maha. ∞ . Menwantara, or $587 \times 14, = 11998$; whereas the Savan year in which the Hindu cypher is kept, gives 4970, to which 30 is added to avoid the fraction of 2, which would have ruined their whole cypher. This will appear from the following examples : As a thousand years denote a day of Brahma, and as five of those days are past, answering to 5000 years or the great day, we are to find what proportion of the sixth we are now in : reduce 14 Menwantaras, and 30 years, to the lowest term $14 \times 355 + 30 = 5000$; this number is multiplied by the Matires contained in one day of 24 hours ; thus $5000 \times 864000 = 4320000000$: this in fact being but one year, we must multiply by the excess over

the last thousandth year, or eight hundred and seventeen years, and divide by a thousand. Thus $4320000000 \times 817 \div 1000 = 3529440000$; which again divided by 306720000, the number of suppositious years contained in a Menwantara, gives eleven Menwantaras, and a fraction of 155520000, which reduced by a divisor of 4320000, the number of suppositious years in a divine age, gives 36 divine ages; for example:

As one thousand years are equal to a day of Brahma, what portion of the current day expired A. D. 1815, or A. M. 5817?

as $1000 : 4320000000 :: 817 : 11 \text{ Menwantaras,}$
and 36 divine ages.

$$\begin{array}{r} 4320000000 \\ 817 \\ \hline 1000) 3529440000000 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{r} (306720000 \\ (3529440000 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{r} (4320000 \\ (11 = 155520000 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{r} (36^{\text{th}} \end{array}$$

Answer 11 Menwantara, and 36 divine ages.

An Hindu, for the purpose of making the calculation more intricate, would multiply by the preceding year 816, and add for the current one three human ages, and that portion of the fourth or Cali age, which was past: I have given you these calculations to explain the Hindu system.—But you are too good a mathematician not to know that the answer may be obtained by dividing the given number of years, or excess over the thousands, by seventy-one; thus $817 \div 71 = 11 \frac{36}{71}$.

European authors on this subject, seem to think every feather plucked from an Hindu, a plume in their own cap ; and actually quarrel for pre-eminence in intolerance. In the 1st volume of Maurice's History of Hindostan, p. 141. he tells us, "that every Menu comprises not seventy-one, but only seventy Kulebs (divine ages) each containing four Jugs (human ages) or forty-three lacks and twenty thousand years *." In such an extensive scheme of chronology, however, a few *thousands* or even *millions* of years are not much to be regarded." If the reader should cry out, "where are we now then? In what particular portion of the boundless day of Brahma does the present race of human beings sojourn upon earth?" he shall receive an answer to his anxious inquiry in the unabridged words of the Ayeen Akbery: "Of this, which is the fifty-first year of the age of Brahma, there have been six Menus: and of the seventh Menu, there have elapsed twenty-seven Kulebs, and three Jugs of the seventy-eighth Kuleb, and four thousand seven hundred years of the fourth Jug. But as this calculation was made two centuries ago, when Akber sat on the throne of India, these two centuries must be added to give the exact period of the Calijug: *Risum teneatis amici?*"

The ridicule assuredly does not attach to the Hindus, however it may reflect on the commentator, who might have answered the anxious enquiries of his readers by informing them, that, according to Hindu reckoning, they were then in the year of the world 5797, and that the secretary of Akber wrote in the year 5600 : the Akbery treats of the Maha Menwantara, which consists of 857 instead of 71 years ; and the divine age of 24 instead of one year. According to Hindu reckoning, when the Akbery was written, six Menwantaras, 19 divine ages, and one month, were past. But as the secretary changed the common Menwantara from 71 to 70, so would there be a difference of about eight Maha , divine ages, in 5600 years. The numbers as given by the Brahmans, are always correct, and easily reduced to real time. For example: 14939

	Years.
Six Menwantaras of 857 years, or $857 \times 6 =$	5142
Nineteen divine ages of 24 years, or $19 \times 24 =$	456
Two Parouvans, or half months	2
	<hr/> Years 5600

As the Maha divine age contains twenty-four years, so does the Parouvan represent one year, or the twenty-fourth part of that age. An Hindu, therefore, says, nineteen ages and one month become a common Parouvan ; or the half month is to a

common year, as the Maha Parouvan, or one year, is to a Maha divine age, or twenty four-years : We cannot suppose that the learned author of the Ayeen Akbery was either deceived, or meant to deceive. We may, however, conjecture that although he gave this date, according to the Maha Menwantara he calculated on the same proportion that governed his current one, or seventy to seventy-one ; which would bring his calculation to meet those of the Hindus, who calculate on the Savan year of three hundred and fifty-five days, instead of the prophetic one of three hundred and sixty ; and $355 \times 71 \div 70 = 360$. The author of the Akbery, having adopted the prophetic Menwantara *, of course stated that a Menwantara contained seventy divine ages ; but he never said it “ did not contain seventy-one :” and a very superficial knowledge of figures must evince, that the most trifling error would have upset the whole system. So far from “ thousands and millions” in the extensive scheme of the Hindu cypher, the error of an unit cannot be discovered. For, however, the calculations are varied, they all bear to the same point, and end at the same period. Thus, the author of the Akbery rejects the Puranic Menwantara of 306720000 for the prophetic one of 311040000† ; reducing the number of divine ages

* Vide Table III. p. 9.

† Ibid.

from 71 to 70, that the periods might accord. In like manner, Sir William Jones rejected the Menwantara of 306720000, for that of the author of the *Surja Sidhanta* of 308448000, to avoid a fraction of thirty; adopting the year of 357 days in lieu of that of 355. Still the calculations are just, the divine age being symbolical of five days, and the Menwantara of a current year.

The Chaldean chronology may be explained in the same manner: Their calculations are all made on the year of 360 days; because they reckon by *Σαροι*, *Νεροι* and *Σοσροι*, which equally originate in the subdivisions of time, multiplied into each other, allotting 60 seconds to a minute, 60 minutes to an hour, and 60 hours to a day. The Chinese follow the same numbers, and the Savaṇ day of the Hindus consists of 60 Dandas or Savaṇ hours. The Chaldean second is just half an Hindu Caśt'ha; their minute half a Cala; and their hour half a Mahurta*. These numbers multiplied into each other produce 3600, and 216000. The Chaldeans have, likewise, a period of time, by which they sometimes reckon, consisting of ten days; and in history, the *Νεροι* is often stated at six hundred, instead of sixty, making the *Σαροι* 36000, in lieu of 3600. But this is merely a distinction without a difference.

* Vide p. 20

For their next calculation is then by six, instead of sixty. Berosus supposes the *Neipos* to be six hundred. Thus when he represents a prince as reigning ten *Σαροι*, or 36000 years, it denotes an hundred, in lieu of ten years: the *Σαρος* being three thousand six hundred, the *Neipos* six hundred, and the *Σωσος* sixty.

Another circumstance, which throws much light on chronology, is the cycle of sixty years; which the Hindus trace very accurately for 4988 years from the present time. The Chinese, as well as the Hindus, regulate time by this division; and as their cycles commence with the same year, it is to be presumed, that it was the mode which each nation carried with them, when the world was divided by Noah, between his sons. The Cali age having commenced in the 12th year of a preceding cycle, evinces that the cycle was in use before A. M. 900. The Chinese name the cycle Kya-tse; the Malabars Chi-tran. Each of these nations carries time back to 4002 years before the Christian era; each of them has it's cycle of cycles, a grand period of 3600 years, or $60 \times 60 = 3600$: at the expiration of which, a new grand period commences; so that we have no certain data by which to place the cycles, further back than A. M. 829.

For example, the Spring equinox of the Chris-
VOL. I C

tian era 1807 answered to the first of Chittera Prabava, of the 24th Chi-tran ; Chittera being the Malabar name for the first Hindu month when the Sun enters Aries, and the year commences ; and Prabava being the name of the first year of every Chi-tran or cycle of 60 years*. The Brahmans either are, or profess to be, ignorant, relative to the period, when the Chi-tran was first introduced. But this ignorance is probably assumed, with a view to carry the period back beyond it's real date. It is certain, that the Cali age commenced when eleven years of the second cycle of a grand period had elapsed ; from which they infer that this period ended on the 3528th year of the Cali age : which is certainly correct, as will be proved by calculating back, from the present time, A. D. 1815, or year of the Cali age 1917, which answers to the Malabar year Yeevan, which commenced in April last ; being the ninth year of the 24th Chi-tran, or cycle of 60, which commenced A. M. 3529, or years B. C. 473. Now if a grand period commenced 71 years before the Cali age, it commenced 3173 years before the Christian era, answering to the year of the world 829 ; to which adding 3600 years, the succeeding or present period commenced A. M. 4129, or in the Cali year 3529 ; and $3600 - 71 =$

* Vide Appendix (A)

3529, the first year of a grand period, which answers to the Spring equinox of the 427th year of the Christian era : from which to A. D. 1807; when the 24th, or present cycle commenced, is 1380 years; which period, divided by 60, gives 23; evincing that the calculations are just. For the Cali year $3529 + 1380 = 4909$; and the year of Christ $427 + 1380 = 1807^*$; proving, beyond controversy, that the Cali age commenced B. C. 3102, or A. M. 900.

There is another division of time on the coast of Coromandel, by which the Malabars represent the age of the world, viz.

Raradauyaken 640000

Teradauyaken 320000

Dayaubrayaken 80000

Kaleyouken 40000

The aggregate gives 1080000, one-fourth part of a divine age. But as these numbers are not found in any classical author, and form no part of the Hindu cypher, they are irrelevant to the present enquiry.

The dynasties of the Chaldeans and Egyptians are, in respect to time, subject to the same objections with those of the Hindus; and may be equally reduced to a conformity with the Hebrew text of the Bible. We must, however, recollect, that the

* Vide Letter II. and Appendix (A).

Chaldeans reckon by *Σαρόι*, and consequently by years of 360 days; whereas the Hindus usually reckon by years of 355 days; sometimes by years of 357; and at other times by years of 360 days, according to the Menwantara adopted.

The original year of the Vedas, } 306720000.
of days 355, or }

That of Meya or the Surya Sidd- } 308448000.
hanti, 357, or }

That of the Chaldeans or prophe- } 311040000.
tic, 360, or }

One author informs us, that “ the Chaldeans present us with an unmeasurable account of time in their first dynasties. The times of their first kings are reckoned, not by years, but by *Σαροι*, *Νειροι*, and *Σωσοι*. Now according to them, every *Σαρος* contains 3600 years, *Νειρος* 600, and *Σωσος* 60. They reckon 120 *Σαροι* from the beginning of the reign of Alorus or Adam, to Noah; making the number of years 432000 for ten dynasties, or reigns.” But, in this account, Bishop Stillingfleet alludes to the antediluvian dynasties, which I will explain in a future Letter*. The Chaldeans, like the Hindus, vary their cypher with the occasion. The 120 *Σαροι* of this author were the 1200 years, during which the race of Cain was supposed to rule in Babylon, before the deluge. Another

* Letter the 4th.

author* informs^{us} that "each *Σαρος* contained 6000 years." This number multiplied by 120 *Σαροι*, which are equal to 432000 *Matires* of the *Hindus*, give 720000, or $6000 \times 120 = 720000$. But neither of these authors alluded to the four ages. The latter number denoted a day of the Deity, or period of time of 1000 years. For as 432000 *Matires* are contained in one half day, or 12 hours, so are there 720 periods, or half days in one year, or $311040000 \div 432000 = 720$; and $720 \times 1000 = 720000$; making 6000 *Σαροι*, equal to 1000 years.

The prolonged periods of the Chinese may be explained in the same manner; their cycle, like that of the *Hindus*, consists of 60 years. But to prevent the necessity of giving names to each year, their cycle is composed of roots and branches, so constructed, that no two ever come together more than once, during the same cycle. Ten characters, called roots, are placed on one side; and 12 signs, called branches, on the other: so that the number of years elapsed from the commencement of the cycle is known from the root and branch that appear together. This sometimes leads to mistakes; particularly when translators are not well acquainted with the Chinese characters. Thus, although the deluge is placed in the same year of

* Salmasius.

the world by the Hindus and Chinese, and the commencement of their cycles agree, each placing the deluge in the 47th year of a cycle, Couplet places it in the 40th year; a difference which will be accounted for in treating of the Chinese antediluvian dynasties. They, like the Hindus, profess ignorance as to the period when the cycle was first introduced; and this has occasioned a difference of opinion relative to the epoch of the general deluge. For, although each nation place the reign of their first postdiluvian ruler at the distance of 3267000 years, which answers to the Cali year 757 (for 3888000 is to 900 as 3267000 is to 756), and place the deluge one year prior thereto, answering to A. M. 1656, yet some pretend, that if the deluge happened in the 47th year of the 14th cycle of the last grand period, which commenced 71 years before the Cali age, or B. C. 3102, then the Chinese epoch of the world must have been so far back as 2060 years before the Julian period; and consequently that 4427 years had expired before the deluge. In order to obviate this objection, great pains have been taken to change the epocha of the Cali age. We are told, that the mistaken doctrine, of an oscillation in the cardinal points, compelled the Hindus to place it 1920 years too early; and that, because according to their calculations in the year of Christ 499, the vernal equinox was found by

observation in the origin of their ecliptic, they were of opinion that it must have had the same position in the first year of the Calijug, and were therefore induced, by their erroneous theory, to fix the beginning of their fourth period 3600 years before the time of Vara'ha.⁷ Now no one part of this theory is true. First, although the antediluvians were sufficiently versed in Astronomy, to have a systematic knowledge of that science, yet we cannot suppose that the doctrine of oscillation was known in the year B. C. 3173: and our reason forbids us to admit that the epocha of the Cali age, which is established in the Vedas, and in the institutes of Menu (both of which are admitted to be antecedent to the Pentateuch of Moses), could have been regulated by the appearance of the heavens, five hundred years after the birth of Christ. Secondly, as a grand period of 3600 years did not commence with the Cali age, that epocha could not have been regulated thereby: it being an established fact, that the first grand period, or cycle of cycles, commenced 71 years before the Calijug or Cali age, that one only of these grand periods have elapsed, and that we are now in the 24th cycle of the second period of 3600 years*, although we entered into the fourth grand age, 4917 years ago. The Calijug or Cali age was fixed at B. C. 3102,

* Vide Appendix (A).

not because "the Hindus established the beginning of the precession according to their ideas of it, in the year of Christ 499;" but because, according to their ideas, the epocha of the world was 900 years prior thereto. Consequently the grand period, or cycle of cycles, that commenced B. C. 3179, and which continued 3600 years, could not have had any influence in fixing the period of the fourth age; although it establishes the assertion, that the Chinese and Hindu epocha of the Creation was the 711th year of the Julian period, or the year B. C. 4002. Nevertheless, no very great reliance can be placed on the early records of the Chinese: since they admit, that the second Emperor of their fourth dynasty ordered all the records, civil and religious, to be destroyed, about 200 years before Christ; and, although a few copies were recovered in the succeeding reign, they are said to have been so mutilated by damp and worms, that many chasms were supplied by the old literati. Their dates are, however, tolerably correct; and in most instances they agree with the Hebrew text of our Bible. The birth and reign of the first postdiluvian ruler Yau, corresponds with that of Noah. And the Chou of Fo-hi corresponds with the creation of Adam. They, like the Hebrews, admit but of six sovereigns in succession, between Adam and Noah. And, although they do not furnish the number of years during which each king reigned, we

learn that the aggregate number was 726. Martinus, Couplet, and others, who profess to believe that Fo-hi was Noah, record that he reigned in China 115 years, and that his reign commenced 2952 years before Christ. These assertions are scarcely worth refuting: since they place the commencement of the reign of Fo-hi at 600 years before the flood; when Enos, the great sire of Noah, in the seventh degree, was yet alive, and ruling over that country, which he had inherited from Seth. But they go further; they place the death of Fo-hi 485 years before Noah entered the ark; making him the ruler over China 700 years before, according to their own account, China was peopled. The Chinese accounts, on the contrary, say "Fo-hi the son of Heaven, the first created, reigned 115 years:" but the commencement of his reign is fixed at A. M. 817, as appears in the history of their kings. They further record that the Chou of the first Emperor, that is, of the first Emperor, or ruler of the new world, commenced A. M. 1054, which the missionaries very correctly place at the year B. C. 2952. But the Chou of the Chinese, like the Antara of the Hindus, denotes his time or birth. The Hebrew text of the Scripture places the birth of Noah at A. M. 1056. The Chinese proceed to say, that this prince, named Yau, commenced his reign one year after the deluge; which even the missionaries, who place it in the 41st year of a

cycle, suppose to have been in the year B. C. 2356, or A. M. 1650. I cannot, therefore, agree with those authors who suppose Fo-hi to be Noah, and reject the Hebrew for the Septuagint text, in a hope to obviate the absurdity of having professed, that a prince, who was placed seven reigns and ten generations antecedent to the one, whose reign, they admit, commenced A. M. 1650, was Noah. A very little attention to dates will enable us to reconcile all oriental chronology with real time, in opposition to those authors, who have no hesitation in ascribing all to oriental vanity and fiction, or by introducing a system subversive of reason, would reduce the age of the antediluvian patriarchs below the level of the present race of men. We are told by Maurice, vol. II, p. 51. "that with any exactness to arrange a system of chronology boundless in its retrospect, and perfectly devious from the known and established principles of chronology, in other kingdoms of the habitable earth, would be a task impracticable to any historian, however indefatigable." And the same author, determined to give himself the utmost possible latitude in chronology, adopts that of the Septuagint, which he says "gives nearly 1500 years more to the age of the world than the Hebrew text, and the Vulgate; and supposes, with the learned Doctor Jackson, that the oldest and most renowned Belus, the founder of the Chaldean dynasty, began his reign at Babylon.

2233* years before Christ." This author, indeed, admits that the system he has adopted is attended with difficulties, that he shall not attempt to reconcile; but he considers it so far "justifiable, as it afforded that prolonged space for the grand events recorded in the Asiatic histories to have taken place, on the theatre of the world;" for he adds, "by these means we obtain an addition of nearly a thousand years between the deluge and the birth of Abraham."

While the relaters of Hindu history wrote rather to amuse, than to instruct, it was of little moment how they related events, or what latitude they took in point of time. But now that we are instigated by an ardent desire to promulgate the tenets of Christianity among, perhaps, 60000000 of our brethren, let us be cautious not to excite their contempt, where it is our interest to raise their admiration. What must an enlightened Hindu think of that religion, whose priests admit of an excess of nearly 1000 years, in a period which their most sacred books state at only 352 years? The Hebrew Pentateuch informs us, that Abraham was born 352 years after the deluge:

* Ham is supposed to have first arrived in Babylon B. C. 2246, and to have returned after the confusion of tongues and founded the first regular dynasty B. C. 1238. Vide Tahiti, v.

the Septuagint adds 886 years thereto ; neither the Hebrew, nor Hindu chronology, will be benefited by such an unwarranted latitude ; but were it otherwise, it would be difficult to understand, where the difference is stated at above 4000000 of years, what advantage our author proposes to himself by the assumption of 1000. Of this I am sure, that the most scrupulous attention to truth is necessary, on all religious subjects, with the Hindus ; who are wonderfully well informed both in chronology and theology ; I mean the learned church Brahmans ; and I can affirm, from personal knowledge, that they are anxious to be informed on all matters relative to the cosmogony and theology of Europeans. I have frequently read with them the Old and New Testament. The truth of the former they readily admitted, and considered Christ as a prophet ; yet, adhering to the belief, that no incarnation of the Deity would appear in the Cali age, until that period when the Divine Spirit should appear at Calsi, to judge the world ; they readily admitted that we had, in common, traditions of the same events ; and that we worshipped the same God, under a different name. The prophecies of Isaiah they read with great interest, but were convinced that they alluded to the coming of the Calsi, or last Avatar. Nevertheless, but for local circumstances, many of the

Brahmans I am convinced had become proselytes. How detrimental to Christianity, how repugnant to reason is that system, which ascribes to oriental vanity, all that is not perfectly clear to the limited comprehensions of a few individuals. Those numbers, which give such offence to moderns, were received by the ancients as orthodox: and, when they are properly understood, nothing can be more simple. In these numbers Berosus recorded the dates of the antediluvian dynasties; and we shall find them to correspond also with the dates of the Mosaic account. The same author (Maurice) that so confidently rejects the boasted millions of the Hindus, proceeds to enforce his hypothesis by informing his readers, that "Arrian affirms, that there was a regular succession of Indian kings from the reign of Bacchus to Sandrocallus: that they amounted in number to 53 sovereigns, and their reigns continued during a period of 6042 years." He adds, that "the Indians compute 15 ages to have elapsed between Bacchus and Hercules*. In the same manner we read in Pomponius Mela, that the ancient Egyptians boasted

* Rama Chada, the Bacchus of the Hindu Mythology, was born in the fifth century. Pharaoh Asses, termed Hercules Egyptians, or the Phenecians' Hercules, in the 21st century, consequently 15 centuries elapsed between them. Vide *W. H. R. 186*

to have had *trecentos et triginta reges ante Amasis*, or 330 kings, who swayed the sceptre before Amasis was conquered by Cambyses; whose reigns took up a period of *tredecim millibus annorum*, or 13000 years. Both these dynasties and the extensive periods of their reign, may safely be referred to the same origin—oriental vanity and fiction.”

If we understand these assertions literally, we must, indeed, consider them as fictitious. But we have the authority of Bishop Cumberland, strongly corroborated by Scripture, for saying that the most ancient Egyptian dynasties were not in succession, but the several reigns of petty kings, or fathers of tribes, contemporary with each other; the descendants of Ham. Consequently, if these descendants, and their issue, amounted to 330 rulers, and we have good proof that they greatly exceeded that number, then may we admit that the aggregate of the reigns of ~~330~~ kings, most of them contemporaries with each other, might amount to 13000 years; which is not allowing 40 years to a reign; a very inconsiderable period when the life of man was protracted so far beyond its present duration. We know that the pastors were termed kings. Josephus calls them royal ones, and informs us, that they were so termed from *Hyen*, which has that meaning; and he adds, in those days a considerable number of children, servants, and cattle, caused a

man to be termed a prince. So was Abraham called by Ephron, the Hittite. Such must we suppose the 70 kings which Adonibezek, king of Bezek, conquered, and cut off their thumbs, and great toes; the 60 kings' sons, put to death by Jehu; the 31 kings on the other side Jordan, destroyed by Joshua; and the 30 sons of Jair, who were made princes over 30 cities. Innumerable other instances might be produced, both from the books of Joshua and Judges; and we shall find a very much greater number of kings recorded in the race of Ham, during the time of Joshua, (who was born 100 years before the reign of Cambyaes), than is presumed by the Egyptians, even according to these authors. We do know that the period allotted by the Hebrews, from the creation to the general deluge, was 1656 years; and we might know, if we would receive their records, as they offer them, that the Hindus, Chaldeans, Chinese, and Egyptians, place that great epoch at 1680 prophetic years, which answers to 1656 Julian ones, from the creation; and that, during that period, each of these nations record ten generations of patriarchs, of whom six only, exclusive of Adam, became kings, or governors of the world, before the deluge. Although each nation details innumerable kings, or dynasties of rulers over provinces, whose collective reigns would form a period of, perhaps,

100000 years, yet neither nation pretends, on this account, to procrastinate the epoch of the deluge. Mr. Maurice informs us that "it was during this period, that the stars had four times changed their course, and the sun had set twice in the east: of which assertion the astronomy is as bad as the chronology is false; since, had these events really taken place, they could not have happened within the limits of so contracted a period." From the above he draws the following inferences: that the dynasties of Egyptian sovereigns were on a par with those of the Indians; "nothing more than the children of the sun and moon, and the vast period of their reigns, the revolutions of the celestial bodies."

Herodotus, indeed, informs us, that in the time of their most ancient kings, or from the period of the first settling of the descendants of Ham, in Egypt, the sun had twice changed it's rising and setting. This is, perhaps, what our author alluded to; forgetting that Thoth or Athothes, the grandson of Ham, and second king of Egypt, rectified the year about the middle of his reign, said to have commenced A. M. 1911. Some authors place the alteration at A. M. 1955; if this date be made A. M. 1944, we shall find the account of Herodotus correct. Egypt is said to have been first peopled about A. M. 1807. Now, as in 137 Julian

years there are 139 Egyptian years of 360 days, so in 140 years would the beginning of any particular month have so changed its place as to run twice through the signs of the ecliptic, and return to the point where it at first was : consequently, adding 140 years to A. M. 1807, when Egypt was first peopled, we shall find, that even supposing the period when Thoth changed the Egyptian year, to have been eleven years sooner than it is represented, yet, that the Sun might with truth be said, to have twice changed its rising and setting, without the " astronomy being bad, or the chronology false." Nevertheless a tradition so generally known is given as " one of the most daring vaunts of this vain-glorious people : " it is added, " still however these mighty vaunts of their antiquity however wildly extravagant they may appear, are comparatively moderate when we advert to another remarkable passage in Cicero ; from whose relation we may conclude, that these assumptions of the astronomical periods of Asia, were not unknown in the capital of the Roman Empire : for he acquaints us that the Babylonians and those that contemplated the heavens from Caucasus, by whom he must mean the elder Persians and Indians, had a series of observations extending back for 473000 years." It is difficult to determine on the epoch from whence these 473000 years are

reckoned.—The “elder Persians, and Indians,” is a vague expression, which admits of great latitude. Babylon, we have reason to believe, was one of the first places, in which a regular government was established, after the deluge; and the Chaldeans are admitted, without controversy, to have brought astronomy to greater perfection, than any of their contemporaries, in the infant state of the post-diluvian world. If Callisthenes, the philosopher who accompanied Alexander, when he took Babylon, found regular astronomical observations there for 1903 years, and this has never been disputed, it carries the period of their commencement back to about A. M. 1776, or 119 years after the deluge. With a view of giving the greatest possible latitude, let us suppose that, as this improved, or regular system, commenced A. M. 1776, the 473000 years were reckoned from that period: and this we are warranted to suppose, as it was the period, when the early Babylonians were in the zenith of their power, about ten years before they were dispersed: consequently, they would date their improved system from that period, and give the dates in real numbers; it being antediluvian records only that were written in cyphers. Now we shall find, reading days for years with the prophet Daniel, that $473000 \div 360 = 1313$ prophetic, or 1295 Julian years; so that the informa-

tion, given by Cicero, amounts to nothing more than that astronomical observations were carried back by the Chaldeans so far as A. M. 481.

We learn from the most ancient authors, that about this period Seth had organized and brought astronomy to a somewhat regular form. Those that have the least faith in the Mosaic account, must admit that Adam had some knowledge of astronomy ; otherwise there had been no note of time ; yet it is not probable that it was brought to perfection, or even to a regular system at so early a period. On the contrary, we must suppose that the first reckoning was by a period of time, marked by the rising and setting of the Sun, afterwards called Days ; and it is so marked by the Hindus to this day. Four Samans of three hours being considered as a day, and the like number as a night. From which we may infer, that the seventh day being commanded by God, to be kept holy, the division of time was extended to weeks, and so on. It is not however my intention to trace the rise and progress of Astronomy, but to point out that all Eastern, particularly Jewish, writers expatiate on the proficiency that this science had attained to about the fourth century of the world : Although Enoch is admitted by them all to have subsequently brought it to the highest perfection which it reached in the antediluvian world. Jose-

phus affirms, that "Seth and his family were the first that made regular observations on the heavens, and on the courses and influences of the stars." So that we may reasonably suppose Astronomy, in or about A. M. 481, to have become organized, if not to an accurate, at least to a regular system; and to have been transmitted from that period. Others trace this science to A. M. 284; and Pliny, following Epigenes, dates it from A. M. 54, or, as he styles it, from all eternity. Had not the science attained to a great degree of perfection at the period alluded to, A. M. 481, Elmachinus would scarcely have stated, that about two centuries after, "Enoch measured the circular heavenly orb, and viewed all the constellations, and the twelve signs, in which the planets moved." Nothing can be more repugnant to reason, than to suppose that Noah did not take with him into the ark the records of every science then known. And where were they subsequently so likely to be found as in Babylon, where the Chaldeans profess that they were buried during the flood. Thus the quotation from Cicero, which has been the subject of so much ridicule, is reduced to a simple assertion, that the contemplators of the heavenly bodies from Caucasus, were in possession of astronomical records from A. M. 481, until A. M. 1776; when, from an improved knowledge in that science, the Chaldeans at Babylon introduced a

more perfect system, which was handed down so late as A. M. 2022; when the philosopher Callisthenes sent from Babylon into Greece, to inform his master Aristotle, that they had found regular astronomical observations for 1903 years back. One other reason might be adduced to prove that A. M. 481, or thereabouts, is the point of time alluded to. The Chaldeans, according to Berosus, date their earliest dynasties at 120 *Σαροι* or 1200 years before the deluge. Now 120 *Σαροι* are equal to 1182 Julian years; deducting that number from the year of the deluge 1656, the remainder, or 474, is probably the true epoch. For the Chaldeans evidently meant to infer that the astronomical observations were coeval with their dynasties. Mr. Maurice admits their early improvement in mathematical and astronomical knowledge to be wonderful; and their instruments, although stupendous, and of high antiquity, to be made with such exactness as to evince in the fabrication an intimate acquaintance with the elements of geometry, spherical trigonometry, and other sciences not then supposed to have been cultivated; and their instruments, tables, and calculations remain a superb and lasting monument of their early maturity in astronomical researches.— Now, if this knowledge had not been acquired in the old world, how was it possible it should have attained to so high a state of perfection in the first

ages of the new world? "The system of the Hindus," he tells us "was established in æras of such unfathomable antiquity, that in their ignorance of the real author of the Vedas they have been attributed to Brahma, a visionary being, or to Menu, who if he was not Noah, was a being equally visionary." There Maurice is particularly unfortunate; for the Vedas are neither ascribed to the one nor the other, but to Brahm or the Eternal. And there is nothing more absurd, in believing that the Great First Cause, by whatever name adored, promulgated the precepts of religion and virtue to the first created under the name of Swayambhava, than in admitting that God walked with Adam in Paradise. This may be considered as a visionary distinction. The institutes compiled from the Vedas are attributed to the first Menu, and are supposed to have been pronounced by him 600 years before the birth of Noah, or the beginning of the second age. For were we, in deference to Mr. Bryant, to adopt a system as repugnant to reason, as it is subversive of truth, and admit. "the first year being absolute to denote A. M. 1657," or the first year after the flood, still that would avail little in support of the hypothesis, that if Menu was not Noah, he was a visionary being. Because the Antara of this Menu is accurately traced to the year B. C. 4002; or

according to Sir William Jones to 5788 years before the year of Christ 1788 ; and consequently could denote no other than Adam. The Sanscrit history of this Menu is wonderfully consonant with that given by the most ancient Hebrew authors, who treat of the first ages of the world. " In the present day of Brahma the first Menu was sur-named Swayambhava or the son of the Self-existing* ; and it is he, by whom the institutes of religious and civil duties are supposed to have been delivered. In his time the Deity descended at a sacrifice. By his wife Satarupa he had two distinguished sons and three daughters. This pair were created for the multiplication of the human species, after the new creation of the world, which the Brahmans call Padma Calpiya or the Lotos creation." This account is given by Sir William Jones in his tract on Hindu Chronology, and is so far critically correct.

The present day of Brahma denotes that Calpa, or day, in which the transactions detailed in the Purana occurred. This Calpa consequently was the first. " In his time, the deity descended at a sacrifice," the sacrifice of Abel : " By his wife he had two distinguished sons ;" Cain and Seth, Abel being dead, " and three daughters." Abal

* St. Luke calls Adam the son of God. Vide Chap. III. v. 38.

Pharagius says, that Eve brought forth twins, a son and a daughter, and she called the son Cain, and the daughter Azrum, called by another author Clinia ; who adds that Eve brought forth two other twins, and that she wished Cain to marry Owain the sister of Abel, and Abel to marry Azrum the sister of Cain ; and that on this account, the wrath of Cain was kindled against Abel, Azrum being more beautiful than Owain : that Adam ordered his sons to go up to the holy mount, and offer sacrifices to the Almighty, after which each should espouse his betrothed wife. At this time, says Eutychius, Satan put into the mind of Cain to kill his brother Abel, and marry his sister Azrum. That when the sacrifices were offered God descended in a flame of fire and accepted that of Abel, leaving the sacrifice of Cain untouched. Seth not having been born until after the murder of Abel, there were according to these authors two distinguished sons and three daughters of Adam. These two sons are placed equally by the Hebrews and Hindus at the head of two distinguished lines. By the former, the race of Seth are designated the sons of God, and the race of Cain the sons of man ; by the Hindus, they are severally called the children of the Sun and Moon, or the greater and lesser light. These authors tell us that the first murder was in consequence of the superior beauty of Az-

Am, the sister of Cain. The Scripture says, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair: the Hindus, that the children of the Sun, married with those of the Moon, in consequence of their beauty. It matters very little whether these accounts are true or fabulous, that they are derived from the same source is all that I attempt to demonstrate. To proceed with the quotation:

“Of the five Menus that succeeded him,” says Sir William Jones, “I have little more than their names; but the Hindu writings are very diffuse on the life and posterity of the seventh Menu surnamed Vaivaswat, or child of the Sun. He is supposed to have had ten sons, of whom the eldest was Teshwacu and to have been accompanied by seven Rishi's or holy persons, whose names were Casyapa, Atri, Vasisht'ha, Viswamitra, Gautama, Jamadagni, and Bharatwaya. An account which explains the opening of the fourth Chapter of the Gita. This immutable system of creation (says Crishna) I revealed to Vaivaswat the Sun; Vaivaswat declared it to his son Menu; Menu explained it to Icshwacu. In the reign of this Sun-born monarch, the Hindus believe the whole world to have been drowned, and the whole human race destroyed by a flood, except the pious prince himself, the seven Rishi's and their several wives;

for they suppose his children to have been born after the flood. This general Pralaya, or destruction, is the subject of the first Purana."

Here, it is evident, the first Menu is blended with the seventh. Vaivaswat was the epithet annexed to every Menu in the race of the Sun, or Seth. The seven Rishi's preserved in the ark, were seven divine precepts, not men; and the opening of the fourth Chapter of the Gita alludes exclusively to the first Menu or Adam, and may be understood as follows. The Deity, through his prophet Enoch, revealed this immutable system of devotion or revealed religion to Adam; who declared it to Seth, by whom the whole was explained to his son Enos, who having lived until Noah was 84 years of age, was enabled to instruct the post-diluvian world or in other words, the postdiluvian world knew the sublime doctrine of the Vedas, because they were delivered by Adam, through his son Seth, to Enos, who made them known to Noah, who took these divine precepts with him into the ark. The seven names assigned as the names of the seven Rishi's, that entered the ark, are again blended with the seven sons supposed to have issued from the first Menu. "The story of the Pralaya is concisely, but clearly and elegantly told in the eighth book of the Bhagawata," from whence Sir W. Jones furnishes an abridgement. But

being himself deceived in respect to the meaning of the Pralaya, he has in the unabridged, as well as the abridged translation, in several instances given his own, rather than the sentiments of the Hindus. The following is the unabridged translation of the Pralaya, the subject of the first Purana, entitled that of the Matsya or first Avatara. "Desiring the preservation of herds and of Brahmins, of genii, and virtuous men, of the Vedas, of law, and of precious things, the Lord of the Universe assumes many bodily shapes; but though he pervades like the air, a variety of beings, yet he is himself unvaried, since he has no quality subject to change. At the close of the last Calpa (day of Brahma) there was a general deluge occasioned by the sleep of Brahma; whence his creatures in different worlds, were drowned in a vast ocean; Brahma, being inclined to slumber, desiring repose *after a lapse of ages**, the strong demon Hayagriva (Satan) came near him, and stole the Vedas which had flowed from his lips. When Heri, the preserver of the universe, discovered this deed of the prince of Dánavas, he took the shape of a minute fish called Sap'hari†. An holy king named

* In the Sanscrit "at the close of the ~~11th~~ Menwantara."

† Properly Sap'heri, or Lord of the Waters, the Spirit that first moved on the waters.

Satyavrata then reigned *, a servant of the Spirit that moved on the waves, and so devout that water was his only sustenance : he was the child of the Sun, and, in the present Calpa, is invested by Narayan in the office of Menu, by the name of Sra'ddhade'va, or the God of obsequies. One day as he was making a libation in the river Critamala, and held water in the palm of his hand, he perceived a small fish moving in it. The king of Dravira immediately dropped the fish into the river, together with the water which he had taken from it ; when the Sap'hari thus emphatically address the benevolent monarch "How canst thou, O king, who shewest affection to the oppressed, leave me in this river water, where I am too weak to resist the monsters of the stream, who fill me with dread !" He not knowing who had assumed the form of a fish, applied his mind to the preservation of the Sap'hari both from good nature, and from regard to his own soul ; and having heard its very suppliant address, he kindly placed it under his protection, in a small vase full of water. But in a single night, its bulk was so increased, that it could not be contained in the jar, and thus again addressed the pious prince : "I am

* In the Sanscrit, he reigned in Dravira, a maritime province south of Carnata.

not pleased with living miserably in this little vase ; make me a large mansion, where I may dwell in comfort." The king removed it thence and placed it in the water of a cistern, but it grew three cubits in less than fifty minutes, and said : " O king, it pleaseth me not to live vainly, in this narrow cistern ; since thou hast granted me an asylum, give me a spacious habitation " He then removed it, placed it in a pool, where having ample space round its body, it became a fish of considerable size " This abode, O king, is not convenient for me, who must swim at large in the waters ; exert thyself for my safety ; and remove me to a deep lake." Thus addressed, the pious monarch threw the suppliant into a lake, and when it grew of equal bulk with the piece of water, he cast the vast fish into the sea When the fish was thrown into the waves, he thus again spoke to Satyavrata : " Here the horned sharks and other monsters of great strength will devour me ; thou shalt not, O valiant man, leave me in this ocean " Thus repeatedly deluded by the fish, who had addressed him with gentle words, the king said, " Who art thou that beguileth me in that assumed shape ? Never before have I seen or heard of so prodigious an inhabitant of the waters, who like thee has filled up, in a single day, a lake, an hundred leagues in circumference surely thou art Bhagavat, who ap-

pearest before me ; the great Heri, whose dwelling was on the waves, and who now in compassion to thy servant bearest the form of the natives of the deep. Salutation and praise to thee, O first male, the Lord of Creation, of preservation, of destruction ! Thou art the highest object, O supreme Ruler, of us thy adorers, who piously seek thee. All thy delusive descents in this world give existence to various beings ; yet I am anxious to know, for what cause that shape has been assumed by thee. Let me not, O Lotos-eyed, approach in vain the feet of a Deity, whose perfect benevolence has been extended to all : When thou hast shewn us, to our amusement, the appearance of other bodies not in reality existing, but successively exhibited." The Lord of the Universe, loving the pious man who thus implored him, and intending to preserve *him* from the sea of destruction, caused by the depravity of the age, thus told him how to act. " In seven days from the present time (day) O thou, tamer of enemies, the three worlds will be plunged in an ocean of death ; but in the midst of the destroying waves, a large vessel sent by me for thy use, shall stand before thee. Then shalt thou take all medicinal herbs, all the variety of seeds ; and accompanied by seven saints, encircled by pairs of all brute animals, thou shalt enter the spacious ark, and continue in it, secure from the flood, on

one immense ocean, without light, except the radiance of thy holy companions. When the ship shall be agitated by an impetuous wind, thou shalt fasten it with a large sea serpent to my horn; for I will be near thee, drawing the vessel, with thee and thy attendants. I will remain on the ocean, O chief of men, until a night of Brahma shall be completely ended. Thou shalt then know my true greatness, rightly named the Supreme Godhead. By my favour all thy questions shall be completely answered; and thy mind abundantly instructed." Heri having thus directed the monarch, disappeared, and Satyavrata humbly waited for the time, which the Ruler of our senses had appointed. The pious king having scattered towards the east the pointed blades of the grass Darbha, and turning his face towards the north, sat meditating on the feet of the god, who had borne the form of a fish. The sea overwhelming its shores, deluged the whole earth; and it was soon perceived to be augmented by showers from immense clouds. He, still meditating on the command of Bhagavat, saw the vessel advancing and entered it with the chiefs of Brahmans, having carried into it the medicinal creepers, and conformed to the directions of Heri. The saints thus addressed him: 'O king, meditate on Cesava, who will surely deliver us from this danger, and grant us prosperity.'

The God, being invoked by the monarch, appeared again, distinctly on the vast ocean, in the form of a fish, blazing like gold, extending a million of leagues, with one stupendous horn, on which the king, as he had been before commanded by Heri, tied the ship with a cable made of a vast serpent; and happy in his preservation stood praising the destroyer of Madhu. When the Monarch had finished his hymn, the primeval male Bhagavat, who watched for his safety in the great expanse of water, spoke aloud to his own divine essence, pronouncing a sacred Purana, which contained the rules of the Sanc'hya philosophy; but it was an infinite mystery to be concealed within the breast of Satyavrata, who sitting in the vessel with the saints, heard the principle of the soul, the Eternal Being proclaimed by the preserving power. Then Heri, rising together with Brahma from the destructive deluge, which was abated, slew the demon Hayagriva, and recovered the sacred books. Satyavrata, instructed in all divine and human knowledge, was appointed, in the present Calpa, by the favour of Vishnu, the seventh Menu, surnamed Vaivaswata. But the appearance of a horned fish to the religious monarch was *Máyá*, or delusion; and he who shall devoutly hear this important allegorical narrative, will be delivered from the bondage of sin."

From this Purana Sir W. Jones, in conformity

to the opinion of Mr. Bryant, infer that the first age of the Hindus (that which he terms the Saturnian, and which the Hindus name the age of Virtue) "was in truth the age of the general flood;" thence inferring that, as all the Avatars were placed subsequent thereto by Vayadana, they were all postdiluvian: whereas the first address of the pious Satyavatar to the Sap'heri after he discovered that it was Narayana, denotes the contrary: "All thy *former* delusive descents in this world having been to give assistance to mankind;" and again, "Thou hast shewn us to our amazement, thy appearance in *other* bodies:" evincing that the other Avatars were prior to this. That the Purana described the deluge, and the preservation of Noah and his family, although in a figurative dress; has very generally been admitted. Beyond this, it has been little understood. It comprises a period of more than 1200 years. The Satyavatar who ruled in Dravira, was not Noah: it is impossible it could have been intended for him, for the prophecy was made certainly not later than the eighth century. Noah was of the tenth century, and tenth Satyavatar of the fourth generation, and ruled at the same period with Cainan, the son of Enoa. It is, therefore, to be presumed that they were the same person. The Purana commences by stating that in the last, which was the

second Calpa, a general destruction took place, during the sleep of Brahma. This Purana was written about the same time as the book of Genesis; during the third thousandth year of the world; consequently, the last Calpa was the second, "during the sleep of Brahma." Whose second night did not commence until after fifteen hundred years were past.

Having in general terms stated thus much, it proceeds to particularize, and explain the cause of the flood; the period when idolatry was introduced; by whom the deluge was foretold; the period when the prophet died; the prince to whom the prophecy was made, and the year in which the destruction actually commenced.

We meet with some difficulties in making these divisions; but they arise from European translators substituting their own ideas, and their own expressions, in lieu of those which they find in the Puranas. For example, in the transcript under consideration, we find "after a lapse of years" substituted for "at the close of the sixth Menwantara;" and in the prophecy "in seven days," rendered "seven days from the present time." These are not intentional misrepresentations: the translator appears not to have known, that "the close of the sixth Menwantara" denoted the sixth Antara of Menu, marking the period when the race

of Atri returned. He therefore changed the phrase to one more consonant to European languages; and having probably asked his Pundit from what period the seven days commenced; he answered from the present day, the day of which he was treating, which denoted the beginning of the first day of Brahma, and first thousandth year of the world; the first day of the creation. As we read "in the present day of Brahma the first created was named Swayambhava," and in other records "on the day of his creation, the first Menu was named Swayambhava, son of the Self-existing;" whereas, introducing *time*, for *day*, made an alteration of 7 or 800 years in the date. For, from the present *time*, denoted from the period of the prophecy. Seven days from the present *day*, would have sounded inharmonious; to prevent which the alteration was doubtless made. The Sanscrit passage is literally as follows: "At the close of the sixth Menwantara the Deity being inclined to slumber, retired for the purpose of repose. During which the giant Hayagriva (or, Satan) stole the Vedas. At this time Satyavatar ruled in Dravira, a maritime province south of Carnata." From this we learn, first, that the Hindus believe that the deluge was ordained in consequence of the Vedas being stolen (idolatry introduced), and that this change in religion occurred, when 426 years were passed: for

$71 \times 6 = 426$; secondly, that Satyavatar was not intended for Noah; because the former was the ruler over a province, before the latter was born; and thirdly, that the prophecy was made by that divine Spirit (in the form of Buddha) who had previously infused a portion of his wisdom into other Avatars for the preservation of mankind, and now animated the body of their great prophet Parasa Rama. For the epoch of 426 years does not allude to the period when the prophecy was made, but to the return of Cain; and that he did return on, or about that year, is equally confirmed by the Hebrew and Chaldean historians. The Hindus are wonderfully correct in their mode of marking time, considering the first 500 years of every period, or millenary, as the day, and the remaining 500 as the night of Brahma: The deluge having commenced after 1500 years (the Purana says, during the sleep of Brahma the Vedas having been stolen A. M. 420) they express it by the Deity being *inclined to slumber*, his sleep not commencing, until after 500 years. The Purana next states the year in which the deluge would commence. "In *seven days*, O thou tamer of enemies, the three worlds will be plunged in an ocean of death." "When that period arrives, a miraculous vessel shall be sent for thy preservation." It proceeds to give directions relative to

the animals that were to be taken into the ark. This nearly corresponds with the Mosaic account. In the seventh chapter of Genesis, we read that the Lord appeared unto Noah, directing him to take into the ark provisions of every kind, and of every clean beast by seven, the male and his female; and of every unclean beast by pairs, for "yet *seven days*, and I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights." If understood literally, these accounts equally tend to prove, that the Deity appeared, and gave these orders only seven days before the rain began to fall; which is a palpable absurdity. For it seems morally impossible, for eight persons, four of them women, to have conveyed into the ark during the ~~short~~ period of seven days provisions sufficient to feed so vast a number of animals for twelve months. The hay only, on a very moderate computation, could not have been less than three thousand tons, to say nothing of at least 1800 animals, as food for carnivorous beasts and birds. Now the Hindus do not understand the phrase seven days literally; but as prophetic of the number of years between the creation and the deluge; whilst the modern Hebrews, who considered them as seven days of twenty-four hours, qualify the expression, by expounding the 120 days in the third verse of the sixth chapter of Genesis, as denoting that the Almighty

again gave notice of this event to Noah, 120 years before it occurred, for the purpose of giving him time to build the ark, and to make the necessary preparations. The text, according to my comprehension, does not admit of such interpretation. But if it did, it in no way obviates the objection ; although it impeaches both the faith and obedience of Noah. First, as requiring an appearance of the Deity to confirm the prophecy : and secondly, after such sign was given, as disobeying the order. For if we understand the text literally, nothing farther than preparing the ark was done, or thought of, seven days before the deluge. “ An omniscient God could not have appeared seven days before the waters began to fall, for the express purpose of ordering the number of birds and beasts that were to be caught and taken into the ark, together with their food, &c. had the former order been complied with. But the text does not so imply. For to whatever the 120 years alluded, they were certainly a part of the prophecy made by Enoch, at least they bear the same date. The text is as follows, “ And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair, and they took them wives of all which they chose ”

“ And the Lord said, my Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh ; yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years. There were giants in the earth in those days, and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men *.”

The latter part expresses the period when the Lord said, “ Man’s days shall be an hundred and twenty years ;” for it particularizes the two races of giants ; those days, when the prophecy was made, evidently alluding to the giants of the third generation of the race of Cain. It never has been disputed, that the children of men were the race of Cain, and the children of God the race of Seth. Accordingly the chapter commences by saying, in consequence of the return of this race, when *men* (the sons of Cain) *began* to multiply and had daughters, the sons of God (the family of Shem) seeing that the daughters of the race of Cain were more handsome than those of their own race, took wives therefrom. In consequence of which, and of other abominations, the deluge was foretold by the prophet Enoch ; the 120 years being a part of the subject of that prophecy, and probably denoting, that as the impiety of man increased with his lengthened years, in the new world it should

* Gen. vi. 1, 2, 3.

be reduced to 120 years. And such was the case, soon after the deluge. For as soon as the sons of ~~noah~~ (the race of Ham) began to multiply on the face of the earth, their age was reduced to an hundred and twenty years. Abraham was the last in the race of Shem, that reached 170 years; and of him it is said, "he died in a good old age, an old man and full of years." "Those days" could not allude to any period after the death of Adam, because it was not until after his death that Seth and his race retired to the holy mount. Adding therefore 120 years to the age of Adam, it would only reach to A. M. 1051; or admitting a palpable contradiction, and supposing, "*and also after that*" to mean *at that period*, then, as the very latest period assigned for the sons of God coming down from the mount to the daughters of men was the 40th year of Jared, or A. M. 1331, it would fall two centuries short of the deluge. For $1331 + 120 = 1451$. It has been urged, that the 120 years are explained by St. Peter. But that verse of the Apostle's Epistle is very obscure; he records that "Jesus went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometimes were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." This does not elucidate the subject. "While the ark was preparing," being equally applicable to the

period when the prophecy was first made, as to any subsequent period. For there is no allusion to any given portion of time; "the long-suffering of God" evidently alluding to his having made known his divine will, and allowed 800 years for the repentance of mankind. If the Almighty actually appeared to give directions for the building of the ark, there was neither long-suffering nor forbearance in withholding the deluge, until it was completed. Considering the text, as given in the sixth chapter of Genesis, in its literal sense, the destruction of mankind by the deluge was only determined on 120 years before it took place: which is denying altogether the prophecy of Enoch, who was translated 548 years prior thereto. The Hindu ~~text~~ is more clear. It records nearly literally, the beginning of the sixth chapter of Genesis; treats of the "giants of those days;" the giants of the third generation, with whose daughters, on their return to the splendid city, the seat of regal power, the sons of the Sun intermarried: adding, that even the great Dasaratha, (the Mahalakeel of Scripture) married a daughter of the Lunar dynasty, subsequent to which, the Deity descended in the form of Buddha (Rama) during the third age, or from A. M. 700 to A. M. 900, forbidding all intercourse with the idolaters, and foretelling

the deluge in these prophetic words. " In *seven days* all creatures that continue to offend me, shall be destroyed by a deluge." Now seven days in the prophetic language, or rather cypher of the Hindus, is equal to 1680 prophetic years of 360 days. For as one day of 24 hours contains 864000 Matires (vide Table III.), so that number multiplied by seven produces 6048000; and 604800 are the number of days of 24 hours contained in seven prophetic days: For example, $604800 \div 360 = 1680$; and 1680 years of 360 days are equal to 1656 Julian ones. This prophecy, so worded, could not be misunderstood: because the seven days commenced from the creation. Here the long-suffering and forbearance of the Almighty is strictly applicable. The race of the Sun had continued without sin for about four hundred years. They then began to apostatise and increased in wickedness for 400 years more; when they were warned of their danger, and allowed 800 years to repent in; at the expiration of which, or 1656 years from the creation, all those who continued in idolatry were to be destroyed. "This prophecy was made to Satyavatar who transmitted it to his descendant, the pious prince, in whose time the prophecy was to be fulfilled. Who " being moved with faith, and

believing in things unseen," obeyed those directions which had been given to his great ancestor; prepared an ark for the preservation of his family; and, having in all things complied with the instruction of Vishnu, sat humbly waiting; constantly contemplating the divine essence, until the final audit arrived. Another remarkable parallel between the Hebrew and Hindu account is, that the former places the general apostacy in the time of Jared, who was the sixth from Adam inclusive, in the race of Seth; and the latter in the time of Rama Chandra, the sixth from Swayambhava in the race of the Sun inclusive.

This Purana was written about the same period with the book of Genesis, and the incidents most probably were collected from the same originals. It is, therefore, a fair inference that the seven days originally bore the same meaning: Faith was the primary virtue attributed both to Vaivaswat and Noah; the latter is said "to have become heir to the righteousness which is by faith." This had been inapplicable to the patriarch, if two descents of the Deity were necessary to induce his belief in the prophecy made by Enoch to his ancestor. In this case he was as great an unbeliever as the rest of the world; and there is no apparent reason for the singular favour shewn him. The veriest sceptic of the present day would be satisfied with

such proof. The Jews required nothing more than a sign to believe in Christ: "If he be the King of Israel," said they, "let him come down from the cross, and we will believe in him." (Matt. xxvii. 42.) But the sixth and seventh chapters of Genesis are clearly defined in the New Testament; and, as explained by the Apostle Paul, correspond with the Hindu Purana. "By faith, Noah being warned of God of things *not* seen, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house, by the which he condemned the world, and became heir to the righteousness which is by faith*." He believed of things not seen; that is, he had faith in those predictions which were not made to himself, but to his ancestor Cainan. For as Enoch was translated 58 years before the birth of Noah, he could not have been an eye-witness of the actions of that prophet; and accordingly the Apostle describes him firm in faith; while the unbelievers, who would give credit to nothing "not seen" by themselves, were destroyed when they thought themselves most secure. It is recorded that they enquired of an oracle. The answer was ambiguous: "The death of the prophet will confirm the prediction." The idolaters understood by this answer, that the flood

* Hebrews xi. 7.

would follow the death of Enoch, and therefore bewailed his translation with such lamentation, that to weep for Enoch became a proverb; insomuch, that on any public or private calamity, it was usual to say the lamentations were as the lamentations for Enoch. But the predicted destruction not immediately following the translation of the prophet, and instead of the world being destroyed, new generations arising, the people became more hardened, and each succeeding generation were more wicked than the former. So that the prophecy which was intended for their reform, "became a stumbling-block," to the antediluvians, as "Christ crucified" was unto the postdiluvian Jews. This is confirmed by the Evangelists Matthew and Luke; where the coming of the Son of Man is compared to the coming of the flood. As the former believed not of their destruction "until the flood came, and took them all away, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be; watch, therefore, for ye know not when your Lord cometh." The prophecy of Enoch was made publicly to the whole world.¹ But the race of Cain, like "the Jews, required a sign, and, like the Greeks, sought after wisdom*." They were not satisfied with the information the Lord thought fit to give them; they went on

* 1 Cor. i. 22.

regardless of the warnings of the prophet, “*eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noë entered the ark, and **knew not until the flood came** and took them all away*.*” Therefore it was said by Christ, “*As the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be.*” If we believe the Evangelists, we cannot believe that the *sign* was given. For if the Deity appeared two several times to give directions relative to the flood; the one descent being one hundred and twenty years, and the other seven days before the rain began to fall; then was the precise period known, and the “coming of the Son of Man” can *not* be “*as the days of Noe were.*” It was not until after the death of Enoch, when the people began to disregard the prophecy, that the race of Seth became apostates; and not until 340 years subsequent thereto, that the general apostacy took place, with the execution of Noah and his immediate great ancestor Mathuselah, the son of Enoch. For there is much reason to think Lamech was an apostate, and one of the unbelievers; considering the prediction relative to his son Noah, as worldly: That he would by culture improve that earth which the Lord had cursed; not that he was born for the continuation

* Matt. xxiv. 38.

of the race of Seth in the new world. As Lamech was born 113 years before the death of Enoch, this could not have been the case, had the Deity appeared again on the same mission, 115 years before the death of Lamech. Thus was Noah placed amidst a lost abandoned world; and although firm in faith, moved with fear; and while others continued eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, employed himself on the one great work which had been enjoined him, by his great ancestors Cainan and Mathuselah. He not only devoted his time and labour agreeably to the command of God, conforming in all things with the direction which he had received; but led a life of abstinence. He continued in a state of celibacy for near 500 years; when that the prophecy should be fulfilled, "prepare an ark for the preserving of thee and thy *family* for the saving of thy *house*." He knew his wife and she bare Japheth, Shem and Ham. And it is observable, that no other children are recorded of this patriarch. Whereas in the genealogy of each of the others, after naming the birth of the son in whom the line of patriarchs was continued, is added the number of years each lived, and it is specified, that they subsequently "begat sons and daughters*." So that if the

* Gen. v.

Hebrew and Hindu accounts differ in trivial matters, that of the latter is amply confirmed by Christ and his Apostles. That the Pentateuch was compiled from the writings of Moses seems as certain, as that the compiler flourished very many years after the death of that prophet*. And so it appears that the fourth Veda was compiled from the three divine Vedas of very much earlier date : which accounts for inaccuracies being found in each. For although Moses is admitted to have been an inspired writer, the author who compiled his works many centuries after his death was not so. And as the five books of Moses in their present form appear to have been compiled many centuries later than the Vedas, it is a probable conjecture, that, when the compiler of the former met with difficulties, he had recourse both to the Hindu and Chaldean records, which Moses had brought with him out of Egypt.

Such, I conceive, was the seven days ; and on such presumption, had the sentence “ yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years ” been taken from an Hindu record, I should have considered it as the date when the prophecy was made, and I should have fixed the period at A. M. 828 ; because $120 \times 360 = 43200$. And as seven Maha prophetic days

* Vide Deut. xxxiv. 5. and following.

denoted 1680 current prophetic years; so does 120 years of days denote seven half prophetic days, the former being produced by multiplying the seven days, by the Matires of a whole day, or 24 hours, divided by 360; and the latter, or 7 half days, by multiplying them by the seconds of 12 hours and dividing by 360. Now in 120 years there are just 43200 days: and the expression is, "yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years." ($7 \times 43200 \div 360 = 840 = 828$ Julian years.). I should therefore have understood from the word, *yet*, that the prophecy was delivered A. M. 828; that being 828 years before the flood:

To return to the Purana, the prophet says to Satyavatar, "I will remain on earth until a night of Brahma shall be completely ended;" that is, the divine spirit, who had just delivered the prophecy, would not end his mortal career, until that period. The night of Brahma ended with the year 1000. Enoch was translated A. M. 988; and $988 \times 365 \div 360 = 1001$. "Then shalt thou know my true greatness, rightly named "the Supreme Godhead," or, when the first thousand years of 360 days shall be *completely ended**, then shall my translation to heaven convince thee, that I

* Denoting that the second year of the second Calpa had commenced.

was indeed an illumination of the Deity. That the great Buddha was exempt from the lot of mortals' death, every Hindu believes : that Nara was the divine Spirit that existed before all worlds, the institutes of Menu record, and the Vedas confirm : " The waters are called *Nara*, because they were the production of Nara or the Spirit of God ; and since they were his first Ayana, or place of motion, he thence is called *Narayana* or moving on the waters." And that by the favour of *Narayana*, *Satyavatar* was instituted a Menu, this *Purana* shews. We may, then, venture to pronounce, that *Enoch* the great prophet who foretold the flood, the type of Jesus Christ, was the same as the great Indian Buddha, *Narayana*, the incarnate God of the Hindus.

The supposition, that *Satyavatar* is *Cainan*, militating against the general opinion, it becomes necessary to state the facts on which that supposition is founded.

First, in the solar pedigree, *Satyavatar* appears as the eldest son of the third generation from *Adam*.

Secondly, the prophet expressly tells the pious prince, that the epoch of his translation should be the end of the first thousand years, and that he, *Satyavatar*, should live to see it ; all of which was fulfilled. The translation of *Enoch* was at the

latter end of the first millenary, when Cainan was yet alive, and who lived 248 years after that event; which took place sixty-nine years before the birth of Noah.

Thirdly, the son of the third generation from Adam was named Cainan; which in the Hebrew signifies not only *lamentation*, but *builder of an ark*, a nest, or place of safety; which is particularly applicable to Satyavatar and Cainan: First, as the prophecy was made in his time; as he lived to see it confirmed by the translation of the prophet; and as his lamentations, in consequence thereof, were such, that to weep as Enoch, became a proverb: and secondly, although the ark was not actually built by Cainan, yet as he lived 179 years after the birth of Noah, and until about 400 years before the deluge, there can be little doubt, but that when he transmitted the prophecy to Noah, he assisted in the necessary preparations for fulfilling the command of the Lord, and therefore acquired the name of Cainan, denoting the ark, nest, or place of safety and retirement.

Fourthly, because, in the Chaldean dynasties, it is recorded by Apollodorus, from Berosus, that in the time of Amenon (who was the son of the third generation in the race of Cain) the Musaris Oannes, the Annadotus, the fish deity, made its appearance from the Erythrean sea. Satyavatar,

according to the Hindus, was governor of a province A. M. 420, or when six Menwantaras were past; the Chaldeans place the return of the race of Cain at A. M. 413, or when fifteen myriads of years were past. But these dates allude to the return of the race of Atri, and to the introduction of idolatry, symbolically called the stealing of the Vedas, not to the prophecy. The Hebrews do not tell us, either when Cainan first became a ruler, or when the prophecy was made by Enoch. But they place the birth of the former at A. M. 326, which renders it probable that he might have been a ruler A. M. 426; and the birth of the latter at A. M. 623, rendering it probable that the prophecy was made, at the time stated by the Hindus and Chaldeans, during the third age, or from A. M. 700 to A. M. 900. The Hebrews state the period when Cainan became a sovereign prince by succession at A. M. 1141. The Hindus after A. M. 1100. The Chaldeans believed that the race of Cain returned after 416 prophetic years, and that the Annadotus, the fish deity, made its appearance in the time of Amenon, during the twenty-seventh *Sapos* of the rule of the race of Cain; when Amenon, like Satyavatar, ruled over a maritime province. The twenty-sixth *Sapos* ended A. M. 730, and according to Berosus, this prince did not become a sovereign until A. M. 1085,

when his predecessor Amillarus died. As appears in Table XXII, the *time* of Amenon was the *Antara* of Satyavatar. According to Abydinus, therefore, Buddha appeared to this prince about A. M. 729. According to Apollodorus, he again appeared among the Chaldeans 140 years after, when, it is probable, he prophesied of the deluge. This was about A. M. 866, and does not differ materially from 120 years of seven half days. But, as the prophecy was intended for the whole world, it is natural to suppose that it was made in different provinces at different periods.

And fifthly, because the name of this prince is equally expressive in the Hebrew, and in the Sanscrit. In the latter it denotes the age, in which the prince was born. The first age, or first four hundred years of the world, is termed Satya, or Crita, which is the same. The prince to whom the prophecy was made was called Satyavatar, or the Avatar of Satya. To this prince the planet Saturn is dedicated; from which the Satya or first age was called the Saturnian age: Cainan was born seventy-four years before the expiration of the Satya, or first age; and although the third of the nine Avatars, in the generation of patriarchs, his history being blended with that of the Matsya, or fish-god, is always termed the first Avatar, although he was not the first Avatara,

or patriarch. Europeans in general, from not considering, or not knowing the derivation of the words, write the name Satyavrata in lieu of Satyavatar. In like manner they write Menwantara when they intend 71 divine ages, changing Menuu-antara, or the Antara of Menu, into Men-wantara*. From the translation of the Matsya Avatar, as given by Sir William Jones, we might suppose Satyavatar to mean Noah. But we must recollect that the translator thought him so, and worded his account accordingly. It is likewise a commonly received opinion among the Hindus, very few of whom study the antediluvian chronology. But this is not confined to our brethren in Asia. Many very pious Christians, who read their Bible through every year, are obliged to refer to the margin, to determine the chronology even of the postdiluvian kings: besides which, the classical Brahmans are interested in deceiving the multitude, Europeans as well as natives. For the deluge being universally admitted to have taken place in the Cali age, and being very accurately traced to the 756th year thereof, had they admitted Satyavatar to have been of the Satya or first age, the two intervening ages could not, according to

* Menu in the plural being sounded long, is written Menuu, the two vowels being changed by Europeans into a consonant, they write Men-wan-ta-ra in lieu of Menuu-an-ta-ra.

their extended numbers, have been accounted for. A very little attention to dates and punctuation, will enable us to do away every seeming contradiction in the Purana. The part which alludes to the prophecy ends with the word "attendants," in the sixth line of p. 63. Buddha having retired from the province of Dravira, over which Satyavatar ruled, this prince "humbly waited for ~~the~~ time, which the Ruler of our senses had appointed," not the deluge, but the end of the first Calpa, when, the first night of Brahma being completely ended, the sign would be given, which was to prove the divine origin of the prophet, his translation to heaven: when, by the favour of the Deity, the mind of Satyavatar would be abundantly instructed: that is, the religion which the prophet taught, and the life eternal which was promised in his revelations (on which the Vedas are founded) should all be confirmed by his ascension to heaven, (the translation of Enoch.) And so the ancients believed, who inform us that the sacred volumes were delivered by the Deity to Enoch. The remaining part of the Purana alludes to the descendant of Satyavatar, the prince who was saved in the ark. In another part we read, "the Lord of the universe intending to preserve him from the sea of destruction," gave orders relative to the ark: the obvious meaning of which is, *his*

race, i. e. in his seed, should mankind be renewed. Not that Satyavata himself should live until that period. In like manner, when the promise was given to Abram, the Lord said: "I will make of *thee* a great nation." Yet the patriarch never supposed he should himself be aggrandized; on the contrary, having no children, he was led to suppose that the prophecy would be fulfilled in the child of Eliezer of Damascus, who was born in his house. Should we be less tolerant to the Hindu, than to the Hebrew Scripture? Certainly not: first, as we profess to believe the latter to be compiled from the works of an inspired writer; and secondly, as we have numerous Hebrew scholars, but very few indeed who understand the Sanscrit language: owing to which, the commencement of this Pralaya is rendered nearly unintelligible. In the translation we read, "at the close of the last Calpa there was a general destruction, owing to the sleep of Brahma; whence his creatures in different worlds were drowned in a vast ocean.*" Brahma being inclined to slumber, desiring repose after a lapse of ages, the dæmon Hayagriva stole the Vedas." No one, not intimately acquainted with the subject, would understand these two paragraphs, thus blended, to denote two occur-

* Vide p. 59.

rences at the distance of more than 1200 years from each other. Yet such is the case. The former of the two paragraphs denoting the period when the deluge occurred; [the latter of them, the period when idolatry was introduced: and it should be rendered as follows: "At the close of the last Calpa during the sleep of Brahma, there was a general destruction." The last Calpa ended with the year 1500: consequently, the general destruction, that took place during the sleep of Brahma, was between the years 1501, when his night commenced, and the years 2000, when it ended. The Purana proceeds to inform us, that "this destruction was owing to the dæmon Hayagriva having stolen the Vedas, towards the close of the first Calpa, or when six Menwantaras, equal to 426 years of 360 days, were passed; at which time (the evening twilight of the first day) Brahma felt inclined to slumber." All which is merely a figurative way of indicating that idolatry was introduced at that period, when the race of Atri, or Cain, returned.

There are many passages in this Purana, which agree in the minor details, with those of the Jewish Rabbis. "The pious prince having entered the ark with his *attendants* and the chief of Brahmans, some doubts entering their minds, they thus addressed the prince." "O king, meditate

on the Deity, who will surely deliver us from this danger, and grant us prosperity." Rabbi Ben Syrach records, that the flood not ensuing immediately on Noah's entering the ark, he thus addressed the Deity: "O thou, Lord of the world, wherefore hast thou brought me into the ark, to save, or to destroy me?" The Deity, thus invoked, according to *each* of these authors, appeared, and assured the patriarch of his protection.

That Satyavata was equally the name of the third and seventh Menu, in the race of the Sun, is very probable. It is not unlikely, that the prince who was actually saved in the ark, and who was born just six hundred years before the period foretold for that event, the immediate descendant in a direct line from Buddha, should have been named after his great ancestor, to whom the prophecy is believed to have been delivered; and who, according to the Hebrew text, lived an hundred and eighty years after the birth of Noah: Cainan died A. M. 1236, and Noah was born A. M. 1056. That two distinct characters have been blended, appears certain. In the beginning of the Purana, it is stated that by the introduction of idolatry, the race of man became corrupt with the exception of Satyavata and the seven Rishis. The Rishis in this sense, denote the ten children of Brahma, or the ten patriarchs in the Solar race. Whereas at

no period of Noah's life were seven of the patriarchs living, exclusive of himself. The introduction of idolatry A. M. 420; the prophecy a few centuries after, and the translation of the prophet at the close of the first night of Brahma; or at the end of the first thousandth year of the world, are all said to have happened during the time when Satyavata was ruler over the province of Dravira, south of Carnata. All of which events, we know, happened before the birth of Noah. Satyavata was appointed a Menu before the deluge, during the second Calpa, by the title of Sraddha-diya. Cainan succeeded to the supreme command of that country to which Seth had retired, on the death of Enos A. M. 1141; which was the hundred and fifty-sixth year of the second Calpa. "When Cainan had appointed his eldest son Mahalaleel to be his successor, he died on the fourth day of the month Chizram* A. M. 1236." The Hindus record that the prince saved in the ark was appointed a Menu by favour of Vishnu, when the waters of the deluge had subsided, Anno Cali 757, or A. M. 1657; and to prevent a possibility of his being mistaken for his ancestor Satyavata, he was commanded to assume the patronymic of the solar Menu, Vaivasvata: thereby, without blend-

* Elnachinus.

ing the individuals, intimating that mankind were *preserved* in the *seed* of Satyavatar or Cainan, according to the promise made by the prophet : whereas, had the reign of the prince, saved in the ark, commenced before the flood, he would have been a Menu without creation.

Satyavatar was the governor of a province south of Carnata A. M. 420. This was one hundred years after the birth of Cainan. The Hindus, we have seen, place the deluge when 1680 prophetic years of 360 days were past ; consequently, the prince who was saved in the ark, began his reign 1230 years after Satyavatar became ruler of Dravira ; and supposing the age to answer to the Hebrew text, which we have no reason to doubt, then, if Satyavatar who ruled at Dravira, was the prince saved in the ark, he had attained the age of one thousand three hundred and thirty years, before he became the ruler of the new world : whereas the average life of the antediluvian patriarchs, according to the Hindus, was eight hundred and fifty-seven years ; and, from an extraordinary coincidence in the periods when the two patriarchs Cainan and Noah were born, the epithet Satyavatar became applicable to both. For as each millenary contained four ages, and the first four hundred years of each were named Satya, or the first age, Noah, who was born A. M. 1056, might

very appropriately be termed the Satya-avatara of the second Calpa. He was likewise the Satya, or first Avatara, of the postdiluvian world. It is therefore very probable that he was so designated in the Purana, from which the Matsya-avatara is extracted, and which is said to contain fourteen thousand stanzas. From these, properly understood, what funds of antediluvian history might be obtained.

Having so far explained the Hindu cypher as to enable you to apply it to any authentic record, you may wish to study, I shall reserve the explanation of the Buddhas for a future Letter.

I remain,

my dear Sir,

your's very faithfully,

* * * * *

LETTER II.

MY DEAR SIR,.

As the system of Chronology which I have adopted; militates entirely against that of all modern authors, I shall commence this Letter, by giving you their opinion on the subject. For if it should appear that the Cali age did not commence 3102 years before the Christian era, or, which is the same thing, "that the common opinion that 4888 years of it had elapsed prior to the year of Christ 1788 is erroneous," then, the whole of my system is false. These authors say, (that is, Sir William Jones, whom the rest have copied from) "that when the Chinese government admitted a new religion from India in the first century of our era, they made particular enquiry concerning the age of the old Indian Buddha; whose birth, according to Couplet, they place in the 41st year of the 28th cycle, or 1036 years before Christ. And they call him, says he, Foe the son of Moye or Maya. But Mr. De Guines, on the authority of four Chinese historians, asserts that Foe was born about

the year before Christ 1927, in the kingdom of Cashmir. Giorgi, or rather Cassiano, from whose papers his work is compiled, assures us that by the calculations of the Tibetians, he appeared only 959 years before the Christian epoch: and M. Bailly, with some hesitation, places him 1031 years before it; but inclines to think him far more ancient, confounding him, as I have done in a former tract, with the first *Buddha*, or Mercury; whom the Goths called Woden, and of whom I shall presently take particular notice. Now, whether we assume the medium of the four last-mentioned dates, or implicitly rely on the authorities quoted by De Guines, we may conclude that *Buddha* was first distinguished in India, about a thousand years before the beginning of our era. And whoever, in so early an age, expects a certain epoch, unqualified with *about* or *nearly*, will be greatly disappointed: hence it is clear, that whether the fourth age of the Hindus began about one thousand years before Christ, according to Goverdhan's account of *Buddha's* birth, or two thousand, according to that of Rhadacant, the common opinion that 4888 years of it are now elapsed is erroneous." This account was written A. D. 1788*.

From the foregoing it appears, that the *Hindu*

* See Tract on Chronology, Vol. IV. p. 22. of Sir W. Jones.

chronology in general, and the commencement of the Cali age in particular, is meant to be regulated by the birth of Buddha; which is in itself an absurd hypothesis: because no Hindu era commences from the birth of any one of the Buddhas, although it is a received opinion, that "the third age being completely ended, Buddha closed his mortal career." This was the first Buddha, or Adam; who, according to the Hebrew text, died in the thirty-first year of the Cali, or fourth age, A. M. 931. This error originates in the word *appeared* being rendered the birth, in lieu of the appearance at a particular epoch: but that the Hindu chronology should be regulated by the birth of a Chinese Atheist, born on the borders of Tartary, is contrary to every rational system. Besides which, the Pralaya, or destruction, which was the subject of my last Letter, was translated by this author for the express purpose of proving, that the Buddha of the ninth Avatar was Noah: that Noah was Saturn; and Saturn Satyavatar*. Now according to the Hebrews, Noah was born A. M. 1056; and according to the Chinese in the year B. C. 2952, which corresponds therewith. So that if Buddha was Noah, "and first distinguished in India about a thousand years before the begin-

* See Works of Sir W. Jones, Vol. III. p. 332.

ning of our era," the adopting any one of the opinions founded on the authorities above quoted, proves, either that Noah was born only one thousand years before Christ, or that the birth of Foe is wholly unconnected with the commencement of the Cali age. And the hypothesis is not rendered less objectionable by this author, supposing that the Chinese Buddha was "confounded with the *first Buddha*, or Mercury; whom the Goths call Woden:" because he asserted *Buddha* to have been of the third generation from Noah, and married to a daughter of that patriarch, named *Ila*. You will recollect that *Buddha* denotes a prophet, *Budha* a sage. Nothing is so easy, as to support an argument, so long as assertions are taken as proofs. And this has been the case relative to the chronology of the antediluvians in general.

First, Couplet never wrote Foe the son of *Máyá*. Mo-ye has no allusion to the former epithet.

Secondly, Goverdhana *does not* place the birth of Buddha about one thousand years before the birth of Christ, or Rhadacanta at two thousand years before that epoch.

And thirdly, M. Bailli, who places the birth of Fo, whom the Chinese frequently call Foe the son of Mo-ye, at the year B. C. 1031, never, even by implication, supposes him to be the Hindu Buddha, the

son of *Jina*, or Buddha, of the ninth Avatar. On the contrary, this author calculates the commencement of the Cali age very accurately back to the year B. C. 3102, answering to A. M. 900, which meets the Hindu reckoning to a year. For they suppose this to be the 3892917th year of the world; and the 4917th year of the Cali age, or the

First age.....	1728000	=	400
Second age.....	1296000	=	300
Third age.....	864000	=	200
	<u>3888000</u>	=	<u>900</u>
Portion of the fourth	4917	=	4917
Total.....	<u>3892917</u>	=	<u>5817</u>

The year of the world 5817 answers to the year of the Cali age 4917, and to the year of Christ 1815 *; which corresponds with the accounts, as given by M. Bailli and Rhadacanta; both of whom place the commencement of the fourth age at the year B. C. 3102. For $3102 + 900 = 4002$. This is the chronology attempted to be overset, on the authority of four Chinese authors. Whereas it is admitted "that the Chinese themselves do not even pretend, that any historic monuments existed in the age of Confucius preceding eleven

* Vide Appendix (A).

hundred years before the Christian era." Now each of the four several Hindu Buddhas died before that epoch. But as three of them correspond both in point of time, and the principal events of their lives, with those of the antediluvian patriarchs, and as the second and third make a conspicuous figure in the sixth and ninth Avatars, it is necessary in the first instance to explain how these Avatars are placed by the Hindus. In the fourth table you will perceive that the ages are placed in arithmetic proportion, and it is universally admitted that the Avatars bear the same ratio. But that ratio alludes exclusively to their birth; and in this sense the Hindus in general believe that four Avatars appeared, i. e. were born, in the first age, or first four hundred years; three in the second or three hundred years; and two in the third. But the Bhagavat affirms that the ninth Avatar was born at the beginning of the fourth age, and these are the true data.

To save you the trouble of referring to Scripture dates, I have formed a table according to the Hebrew text of the Bible; shewing the birth, death, and age of the antediluvian patriarchs.

TABLE V.

Names.	Born A. M.	Died A. M.	Aged.
Adam.....	1....	931....	930
1 Seth.....	131....	1043....	912
2 Enos.....	236....	1141....	905
3 Cainan.....	326....	1236....	910
4 Mahalaleel.....	398....	1291....	895
5 Jared.....	461....	1423....	962
6 Enoch.....	623....	988....	365
7 Methuselah.....	688....	1656....	968
8 Lamech.....	875....	1651....	776
9 Noah.....	1057....	2007....	950

The nine descents in succession from Swayambhava in the solar race, or children of the Sun, are designated as Avatars or illuminations of the Deity ; the Children of God. Swayambhava, or Adam, as the general stock from whence the children of the Sun and Moon (the race of Seth and Cain descended) is not included, and of these nine, six only are admitted to have been Menus or sovereigns of the world. They record that "there were six Menus well versed in the Vedas and six others," of both which lines Swayambhava was the chief. Now let us compare the nine descents from Adam, with those from the Hindu. = Adam or father of mankind as Avatars.

	A. M.
1 Seth born	131
2 Enos	236
3 Cainan	326
4 Mahakaleel	396

According to the Hindus when four centuries were passed and four Avataras born, their first age ended, the fifth Avatara being born in the second age which commenced A. M. 401.

	A. M.
5 Jared born	461
6 Enoch	623
7 Methuselah	688

Thus when seven centuries were passed and seven Avataras born, the second age ended, the third commencing A. M. 701.

	A. M.
8 Lamech born	875
9 Noah	1057

From the foregoing, it appears, that the nine Avataras correspond with the nine patriarchs. It is true, the last, or Noah, was born during the fourth age. But it is equally true, that the Hindu records, which never vary from truth, instead of altering the date to make it agree with their hypothesis (like those authors who fly from the

Hebrew to the Septuagint or Samaritan text, whenever it suits their purpose) inform us that the ninth, or Buddha Avatara, commenced at the beginning of the fourth, instead of the conclusion of the third age. And, of a period which was to last five thousand years, an hundred and fifty-seven might very well be termed the beginning.

Europeans in general, following the Hindu poet, suppose the exploits performed in the several Avataras, to have occurred as placed by that author ; which is an evident mistake. For, considering them as celebrated by Jaya Deva, the first, sixth, and ninth, allude to Buddha the son of Máya, and the prophecy of the deluge. Although the ninth, equally alluding to the actions of Buddha the son of Jina, in whom the prophecy was fulfilled, is usually termed the Buddha Avatar. The second and third treat exclusively of Buddha, the son of Máya, who described the fall of man, and prophesied of his redemption. The fourth, fifth, seventh, and eighth are elucidatory of the religious wars carried on by the children of the Sun, against the Idolaters or children of the Moon, during the early part of the old world, before the general apostacy ; all of which I shall explain hereafter. We must now return to those Avataras who became Menus or kings ; of whom the Hindus suppose six in each

race. If we may believe Eusebius, Berosus allotted that number of kings between Adam or Adam, and the deluge, in the race of Cain. And we know that the Hebrews suppose the same number in the race of Seth. For Enoch and Lamech, dying before their respective fathers, could not have succeeded to the sovereignty of the world in succession; and Methuselah having lived until within a few days of the deluge, Noah consequently did not commence his reign in the old world. And so the Purana denotes, saying, "the prince who was saved in the ark was appointed a *Menu*, by favour of Vishnu, after the waters of the deluge had subsided, by his patronymic of *Vai-vaswata*;" which was not only an epithet of the Sun, but the name of the great ancestor of this prince; a person so eminently pious, that many of the Hebrews suppose that the destruction of all created beings, who had offended the Almighty, was withheld until the number of his days were completed. From the last table it appears, that the six patriarchs, who ruled in succession, were named as follows.

TABLE VI.

Hebrew.	Sanscrit.
Adam.	Swayambhava.
1 Seth.	1 Swarupachesa.
2 Enos.	2 Auttama.
3 Cainan.	3 Tamasa.
4 Mahalaleel.	4 Raivata.
5 Jared.	5 Chakreshusha, or beaming with glory.
6 Methuselah.	6 Vaivaswata, or child of the Sun.

That the Mosaic account agrees with that of the Hindus is certain; not only in the number of the patriarchs, or Avataras, but in the date of their birth, and the number who became Menus, or kings, in succession. We must, then, give credit to both, or to neither. A variety of other circumstances might hence be deduced, to prove that the beginning of the Cali age is correctly placed at the year B. C. 3102, or A. M. 960. It is marked by the death of their first Buddha; and Adam died in the 31st year of that age. It is mentioned as the period when idolatry had assumed a gigantic form; when men were consecrated as gods. And the Hebrew writers inform us, that before the death of Adam, A. M. 931, he sent for Seth and his descendants, charging them to retire from the plain, where Abel had been murdered,

and to reside in the mountains; in the holy mount opposite to Paradise, lest they should be drawn to idolatry by the descendants of Cain. Perhaps no period of the old, ~~new~~ world, could so appropriately have been named the age of Sin and Sorrow, as that in which the Hindus place it: "when the earth became corrupt before God, and was filled with violence" (Gen. vi. 11.) given up to idolatry. Those who argue for the removal of this age, are obliged to transform the children of Adam into the children of Noah, as will appear by returning to the quotation, which proceeds to say, "On a supposition that Vaivaswata, or Sun-born, was the Noah of the Scripture, let us proceed to the Indian account of his posterity; which I extract from the *Puranar-thaprecasa*, or the *Puranas* explained; a work lately composed in Sanscrit by Rhadacanta Sarman, a pundit of extensive learning and ~~great fame~~ among the Hindus of this province. ~~Before~~ we examine the genealogies of kings which he has collected from the *Puranas*, it will be necessary to give a general idea of the Avatars, or descents of the Deity. The Hindus believe innumerable such descents, or specific interpositions of Providence in the affairs of mankind. But they reckon ten principal Avatars in the current period of four ages, and all of them are described in order as they are supposed to

occur in the following Ode of Jayadeva, the great lyric poet of India."

THE ODE.

1. Thou recoverest the Veda in the water of the ocean of destruction, placing it joyfully in the bosom of an ark fabricated by thee! O Cesava, assuming the body of a fish, be victorious, O Heri, Lord of the Universe!

2. The Earth stands firm on thy immensely broad back, which grows larger, from the callous occasioned by bearing that vast burden. O Cesava, assuming the body of a tortoise, be victorious, O Heri, Lord of the Universe.

3. The Earth placed on the point of thy tusk, remained fixed like the picture of a black antelope, on the Moon. O Cesava, assuming the form of a boar, be victorious, O Heri, Lord of the Universe.

4. The claw with a stupendous point in the exquisite Lotos of thy lion's paw, is the black bee that stung the body of the embowelled Hiranyacasipa. O Cesava, assuming the form of a lion-man, be victorious, O Heri, Lord of the Universe.

5. By thy power thou beguilest Bali, O thou miraculous dwarf, thou purifier of men with the water (of Ganga), springing from thy feet. O Cesava, assuming the form of a dwarf, be victorious, O Heri, Lord of the Universe.

6. Thou bathest in pure water, consisting of the blood of Cshatriyas, the world, whose offences are removed, and who are relieved from the *pains* of other *births**. O Cesava, assuming the form of Parasa Rama, be victorious, O Heri, Lord of the Universe.

7. With ease to thyself, with delight to the Genii of the eight regions, thou scatteredst on all sides in the plain of combat the dæmon with ten heads. O Cesava, assuming the form of Rama Chandra, be victorious, O Heri, Lord of the Universe.

8. Thou bearest on thy bright body, a mantle shining like a blue cloud, or like the water of Yamuna, tripping towards thee through fear of thy furrowing ploughshare. O Cesava, assuming the form of Bala Rama ; be victorious, O Heri, lord of the Universe.

9. Thou blamest, O wonderful, the whole Veda, when thou seest, O kind-hearted, the slaughter of cattle prescribed for sacrifice. O Cesava, assuming the body of Buddha ; be victorious, O Heri, Lord of the Universe.

10. For the destruction of all the impure, thou

* Denoting that those who believe in the revealed religion of their incarnate God, Parasa Rama, would be exempt from transmigration, to which others were subject.

drawest thy cymetar like a blazing comet, how tremendous ! O Cesava, assuming the body of Calci, be victorious, O Heri, Lord of the Universe !

These ten Avataras, our author proceeds to inform us, " are by some arranged according to the thousands of divine ages in each of the four ages. And if such an arrangement were universally received, we should be able to ascertain a very material point in the Hindu Chronology, I mean the birth of Buddha; concerning which the different pundits, whom I have consulted, and the same pundits at different times, have expressed a strange diversity of opinion. They all agree that Calci is yet to come, and that Buddha was the last considerable incarnation of the Deity. But the astronomers of Varanes place him in the third age, and Rhadacanta insists that he appeared after the thousandth year of the fourth. The learned and accurate author of the Dabastin, whose information concerning the Hindus is wonderfully correct, mentions an opinion of the pundits with whom he had conversed, that Buddha commenced his career ten years before the close of the third age. And Goverdhana of Cashmir, who had once informed me that Crishnu descended two centuries before Buddha, assured me, lately, that the Cashmerians admitted of twenty-four years. Others

allow only twelve between these two divine persons. The best authority, after all, is the Bhagavat itself; in the first chapter of which, it is expressly declared, that Buddha the son of Jina would appear at Cicata, for the purpose of confounding the dæmons just at the beginning of the Calijug; so that on the whole we may safely place Buddha just at the beginning of the Cali age. But what is the beginning of it? When this question was proposed to Rhadacanta, he answered, of a period comprising more than four hundred thousand years, the first two or three thousand may reasonably be called the beginning. On my demanding written evidence, he produced a book of some authority, composed by a learned Goswami, and entitled Bhagavatamrita, or the Nectar of the Bhagavat, on which it is a metrical comment, and the couplet which he made from it deserves to be cited. After the just mentioned account of Buddha in the text, the commentator says 'he became visible, the thousandth and second year of the Cali age being past; his body of a colour between white and ruddy, with two arms, without hair on his head.'" From the above (as the author conceived) contradictory accounts, he proceeds to comment, by saying, "If the learned Indians differ so widely in their account of the age, when this ninth Avatara appeared in their country, we

may be assured that they have no certain chronology before him ; and may suspect the certainty of all the relations concerning even his appearance."

Here we have a hasty conclusion, as illiberal as it is unjust. The least attention to the originals, from which these quotations were translated, would have explained the seeming mystery, and reconciled the several appearances of the several Buddhas with the text of Scripture.

First, our author does not seem clearly to understand the difference between an Avatara, and an incarnation of the Deity. Of the former, the Hindus believe in an infinite number : Of the latter, certainly they believe but in one, among the nine principal Avataras which are past. An Avatara denotes a man of eminent piety ; a man highly endowed by the Almighty with religious knowledge. In like manner as Elias, or Elijah, and others, were called the men of God. In the instance before us, the appellation is used to distinguish the patriarchs of the pious race of the Sun, or Seth, from those of the idolatrous race of the Moon, or Cain. Had these Avataras, in the sense in which Europeans commonly understand them, been placed according to the divine ages, in arithmetic proportion, it would have amounted to a proof, that they were fabulous. For who can

seriously suppose, that a divine incarnation, or even prophetic knowledge, was diffused by the Almighty at stated periods, governed by mathematical principles? But considered in their true light, as the eminently pious descendants of Seth, the patriarchs of the antediluvian world, they are correctly placed in such proportion: because the number of centuries in each age agreed with the number of Avatars; and the dates of the births of the patriarchs according to the Mosaic account bear to one another a similar ratio. Secondly, "they are by some arranged according to the thousands of divine ages, in each of the four human ages." They may be so arranged by *some European* authors. But no Hindu could so arrange them. For the aggregate of the four human ages, or 4320000 years, is considered but as one divine age, or 1200 years; and the Hindus are too well versed in mathematics, to produce thousands of divine ages from a period that comprises just a tenth part of one, or the fourth age. The Avatars as arranged by Jayadeva, have no allusion to proportion or time. They are placed according to historic record, detailing the blessings that *Nara* the great God of hosts conferred on mankind, from the creation to the deluge. Accordingly he makes the prophecy of Enoch, in the Sap'heri, or fish Deity, the first: and Buddha, or Noah who was

saved in the ark, the last Avatara. For Vaivaswata was designated a prophet, and an Avatara, although not an incarnate God. The three first Avatars are continuations of one subject, the prophecies of Enoch. In the first, Buddha the son of Máya preaches repentance, and foretels the deluge ; explaining that as the fall of man was a type of death, *his* translation to heaven should be a type of the resurrection and life eternal. This subject is explained, and continued in the second Avatar, under the symbol of the Amrita, or water of immortality, which the prophet ensures to all those who became regenerate and are born of the Gayata or Spirit. In the third is portrayed the final overthrow of Satan, at the end of the days, or present age. Here the prophet is depicted as Atlas* treading Satan under his feet, and supporting the world against all the machinations of the prince of darkness. The sixth represents the incarnate God, or this Buddha, as the divine Rama : the ninth Buddha the son of Jina the prince who was saved in the ark : and the intervening Avatars represent the heroic actions of those patriarchs who opposed the growth of idolatry in the old world, so placed as

* Eusebius records from Eupaternus that the Babylonians believed Enoch to be the great Atlas, the promoter by a new system of astrology, or what we call Astronomy.

to correspond with the events, without any regard to primogeniture, in the Avataras who performed them.

Nothing can be more easy than to reconcile the dates at which the several Buddhas appeared; although this author would persuade us that they all equally allude to the ninth Avatar, an idea perfectly European*. Buddha, like Budha, is a generic word; the former applicable to any person eminently gifted with prophetic knowledge, and as such applied to Swayambhava and the divine Rama, as prophets of the antediluvian world, and to Vaivaswata and Crishnu of the postdiluvian world. In the two former we trace Adam, and Enoch, under the epithets of Buddha, the son of the Self-created (having had no mortal parent); and Buddha the son of Máya or divine delusion; elucidatory of their belief, that the Deity was actually incarnate in this Buddha. In the two latter, we cannot mistake Noah, and Moses, described as Buddha the son of Jina, who was born at the beginning of the fourth age, for the purpose of confounding the dæmons by continuing the race of man in the postdiluvian world: and Buddha called Crishnu (a corruption of Vishnu) and named the black

* The Hindus term the first Buddha the son of the Self-created; the second the son of Máya; the third the son of Jina; the fourth the son of Devica.

shepherd, to denote the transactions he had with the Egyptians, in whose country he was born. The miracles performed by him were during the middle of the third Calpa, or period of time answering to A. M. 2500, or thereabout. Those of Moses are stated by the Hebrews to have taken place immediately before he left Egypt: And the children of Israel were delivered A. M. 2513.

Lest it should be alleged that the foregoing are merely assertions, and that assertions are not proofs, we will proceed to examine the ground on which they are formed. It is universally known that even those authors, who insist that the Hindus have no knowledge antecedent to the deluge, and know nothing of the Buddha of the ninth Avatar, independent of the principal event of his life (the universal deluge) admit that the Puranas "contain the history of the world from the creation to the Buddha Avatara."

That the first Buddha was Adam, we learn from the following. "The third age being completely ended, Buddha finished his mortal career." This age ended with the year 900. Adam, according to the Hebrews, died A. M. 931: Alorus according to the Chaldeans died A. M. 928. Each was created, according to their several historians, in the year B. C. 4004; and this Buddha, according to the Hindus, in the year B. C. 4002.

The second Buddha, the incarnate God, could have been no other than Enóch. For it is recorded that in consequence of the Vedas being stolen (idolatry introduced), the Deity actually descended from his paradise to redeem mankind ; that he was absent from Heaven a day and night of the Gods ; and re-ascended to heaven, when the night of Brahma was completely ended. Enoch sojourned on earth 365 years. Here we read years for days. For it is expressly said, " a year of mortals is a day and night of the Gods, and regents of the universe." We have not only the period of his sojourn on earth, but of his birth and translation. He lived 365 years, and ascended to heaven at the close of the first night of Brahma ; or immediately after the first thousandth year of the world expired. A thousand years of 360 days are equal to 986 years of 365 days and 6 hours ; and $986 - 365 = 621$. Enoch was born A. M. 623 *. This is the Buddha whom the astronomers of Varanes place in the third age, or from about A. M. 700 to A. M. 900 ; and whom the author of the Dubistan mentions as having commenced a glorious career ten years before the close of the third age answering to A. M. 890, or, more correctly to 890 prophetic years. This is about the time in which

* Vide Table V.

Apollodorus, who copies from Berosus, places the appearance of the Annadotus or fish-deity of the Chaldeans. This prophet being born towards the end of the second age, and translated in the beginning of the fourth, his exploits are very correctly placed by the astronomers, who speak in general terms, "during the third age." The more accurate author of the Dubistan fixes his career of glory at just ten years before the expiration of the third age: of events the whole of which were glorious, some doubts may arise, relative to the one alluded to. We might suppose that he meant when the prophet (Enoch), according to Buxtorf, obtained the epithet of Ambassador of God; or when, according to Elmachinus, he measured the circular orb of heaven; or when, according to Bedavius, he received the sacred books from the Almighty; or when, according to St. Paul, he walked with God; and according to St. Jude, he prophesied of the destruction of the world. That the latter was the epoch alluded to by the author of the Dubistan, appears nearly certain from the date, ten years before the expiration of the last age, or 890 years from the creation. And Apollodorus, who copies from Berosus, states the appearance of the Annadotus after 88 *Σαροι* were completed. A *Σαρος* contains 10 years of 360 days each. The prophecy was made, according to this author, from

880 to 890 years of 360 days, from the creation, The Hindus represent the Deity, when he delivered the prophecy in the form of the Sap'heri or fish-deity: Eusebius represents him as a fish endowed with divine intellect. According to Dowe, when he wrote, the two principal Sastras were more than 4800 years old; which carries them back nearly six hundred years before the deluge. These are considered by the Hindus as the production of the second Menu; Menu the son of the first created or Seth. They are considered as an abridgment of the sacred Veda, or revealed religion promulgated by the Deity in an incarnate form, about the close of the third age; which answers to the account of Bedavius. Possibly Mr. Dowe carries the Sastras too far back. But it meets the belief of the Hindus, that they were compiled by the son of Swayambhava, from the revelations of Buddha, immediately after his ascension, which took place at the close of the first night of Brahma, or his day of 24 hours; which answers to the translation of Enoch A. M. 988. This incarnation of the Deity is described as follows:

“ Buddha, the author of happiness and a portion of Narayen, the Lord Haree-sa, the preserver of all, appeared in this ocean of natural beings at the close of the Dwapar, and beginning of the Calijug: He who is omnipresent, and everlast-

ingly to be contemplated ; the Supreme God, the Eternal ONE, the divinity worthy to be adored by the most pious of mankind, appeared with a portion of his divine nature." Jayadeva describes him as bathing in blood, or sacrificing his life to wash away the offences of mankind, and thereby to make them partakers of the kingdom of heaven. Can a Christian doubt that this Buddha was the type of the Saviour of the world ? Abul Pharagius says " Enoch was an observer of the pure commands of God, he did that which was good, and avoided that which was evil, and continued in the worship of God to the end of his life." The ancient Greeks are of opinion, that this Enoch was Hermes ; who is called Trismegistus, or " the author of a *threefold* doctrine ; because he describes God, by his three essential attributes, his existence, his wisdom, and his life ;" which corresponds with the original creed of the Hindus*. " The Arabians call him Edris, and it is reported, that there were three men who were called by the name of Hermes, of whom, this is the first, who dwelt in *Sais*, who was the first of all men who treated of the heavenly substances, and admonished the old world concerning the flood. The second was the Babylonian Hermes,

* See the beginning of the last Letter.

who dwelt in Calvada a city of the Chaldeans, and flourished after the flood, and was the first after Nimrod, the son of Cush, who built a city in Babylon. The third is Hermes the Egyptian, who is called Trismegistus; that is, 'the greatest of the great'. But the Zabii think, that Seth the son of Adam was the Egyptian Agathodæmon, and instructor of the first Hermes; that Asclepiades was one of those kings who was instructed by Hermes, and that he was made by him a governor of the fourth part of the then habitable world; the same that, after the flood, was possessed by the Greeks." This account is nearly literally the same with that of the Hindus, who insist that the son of the first created was the inventor of letters, the author of the Sastras, the instructor of Rama, and the original organizer of Astronomy, which was subsequently brought to perfection by Buddha. And so say the Jews, for although they consider Enoch the first, as the greatest astronomer, they suppose Seth, the son of the first created, to have been his instructor. So that the Hebrews, equally with the Hindus, believed the first Hermes, or Buddha to have flourished in the antediluvian world, in opposition to those modern authors, who suppose him to have been the son-in-law of Noah, Mercury, whom the Goths call Woden. Those who have any knowledge of the

worship enjoined at the Pagoda in Travancore, or of the annual festival held there in honour of the Trimouti, cannot hesitate to pronounce that the adoration of the Deity in Trinity, which is traced back for more than five thousand years, originated with Enoch : that the Hindus date their divine Veda, at the period when Bedavius supposes that the divine volumes were sent from heaven : that they ascribe the Sastras to the same person, whom Elnachinus represents as the inventor of letters, is a presumptive proof that the same persons were intended : and that the birth of the former being traced to A. M. 621*, amounts to a positive proof, that the Buddha celebrated by the author of the *Dubistan*, A. M. 878, was Enoch the son of Jared.

The third Buddha who flourished during the old and new world, who was to appear "at Cicata, for the purpose of confounding the demons, just at the beginning of the Cali age," could be no other than Noah, the son of Lamech, the Buddha of the ninth Avatar. We are now arrived at that period (the Cali age), when fictitious dates are rejected for Julian years. Noah was born in the hundred and fifty-sixth year of the Cali age ; and, of a period which was to last 5000 years, the hundred and fifty-sixth might very correctly be termed the

* See the former part of this Letter. A 101

commencement. The *Bhagavat* on this subject is clear and comprehensive. A prophet was to be born at the commencement of the fourth age*. His mission was to fulfil the prediction of the former Buddha, by confounding the dæmons. According to the Hebrews, Noah was born at the same period, and for the same purpose. He was not born to destroy the race of Cain. But, the race of Seth being preserved in him, the dæmons, or idolaters were confounded. Yet, with this record before him, Sir William Jones demands of Rhadacanta "written evidence;" who produces the *Bhagavatamrita* in proof that "this Buddha appeared after the thousand and second year of the Cali age." Now to refer for the *Bhagavat* to a metrical comment thereon, is as rational as referring for the Scottish history to Chevy Chase. And to infer that Noah, or Buddha the son of Jina, who lived 950 years, could not have appeared at Mugadha A. M. 1902, because he was born at Cicata A. M. 1056, is just as rational, as it would be to assert that this author could not have appeared in India A. D. 1788 (where he wrote this account), because he was born in London A. D. 1746. However, in this instance it so happens, that the *Bhagavat* is confirmed by the metrical comment thereon. For the author of the latter,

* See Account of the Avatars, in the former part of this Letter.

without understanding the text, insists that the Buddha whom the Bhagavat alludes to, as being born at the commencement of the Cali age, appeared 840 years later: thereby identifying the person of Noah; no other person, in the postdiluvian world, having lived that number of years. The Bhagavat informs us that this Buddha was born in the antediluvian world, or which is the same thing, in the beginning of the Cali age, which commenced after years 900, or 700 years before the deluge. The Bhagavatamrita tells us that he appeared two hundred and forty-six years after the deluge, or after the one thousand and second year of the Cali age was past, answering to A. M. 1903: and this date answers to the year B. C. 2100, when, according to Rhadacanta, Purangata, son of the last king of Magadha (of the sacerdotal cast) "was put to death by his minister; who placed his own son on the throne." This is mentioned* as an epoch of the highest importance, "first, as it happened according to the Bhagavatamrita, two years, exactly, before Buddha's appearance in the same kingdom; and, secondly, as it is believed by the Hindus, to have taken place 2100 years before Christ," or A. M. 1902; evincing, beyond controversy, that Buddha the son of Jina, was Noah, the son of Lamech. No other person

* See p. 153.

has been recorded, by any nation, as having attained to so great an age, in the new world. He appeared at Magadha two years after the usurpation of Pradyato, which took place 107 years before the death of Noah. For A. M. $1900 + 107 = 2007$, the year in which the patriarch died. Pradyato was the contemporary of Thoth, or Athothes, king of Egypt. The one began his reign A. M. 1902, the other A. M. 1911*. Pradyato was decidedly of the race of Ham. He was the first prince of the Cshatriya, or military cast, that ruled at Mugadha, after the mild race of Shem were deposed. This is confirmed by a coincidence of several circumstances. Among the most conspicuous, is the omission of the deluge. Sanchoniatho, who copies from the records found at Berytus, and the cosmogony of Thoth, is silent relative to that memorable event; and Rhadacanta, who gives the Solar and Lunar dynasties, from the records of Magadha, as they were written during the dynasty of Pradyato, is equally silent on the subject. Whereas other Hindu recorders are profuse in their account of that great and awful event.

As Noah divided the world between his sons A. M. 1759; as the dispersion from Babylon took place A. M. 1798; as, according to Sanchoniatho,

* Vide Table XXV.

Noah was driven into banishment A. M. 1892, and as Buddha appeared at Mugadha A. M. 1902; it is a fair inference, that he fled to that province for protection. For that Māgadha was originally peopled by the race of Shem we learn from the division of the world. The patriarch allotted the eastern and northern parts of Asia to Shem: to Ham that part which led to Africa, and to Japheth that which led to Europe. The two latter travelled together, and stopt at Babylon, where they occupied themselves in building, and in other pursuits: during which period, the race of Shem were settling themselves in those countries allotted to them. So record the Hebrews, and so believe the Hindus. For while the Chaldeans were taking possession of that country, the Hindus suppose that their ancestors were settling at Māgadha, where they had an undisputed rule for an hundred and fifty years; or from the division of the world, to the usurpation of Pradyato. Thither, according to the Bhagavatamrita, the afflicted Buddha fled for safety. There he appeared as an aged man, without power. Whither was it so likely that Noah should have fled, from the persecution of his rebel son, as to a kingdom inhabited by the virtuous race of Shem? But here, it seems, his misfortunes pursued him. The descendants of Shem were deposed by an usurper of that race, by whom he was persecuted: and no

asylum being afforded him, he migrated yet farther towards China. And although we may safely pronounce that he never reached that country, yet we may suggest that he travelled so far eastward, as to be beyond the boundary of either Assyrian or Hindu historic knowledge; and, with the exception of the year in which he died, the Scripture is totally silent respecting Noah. If Buddha appeared at Mugadha, it was only as he passed eastward: for Rhadacanta, who gives the dynasties of that country, is totally silent respecting him, as an Avatara, although he mentions the other Avataras: and the author of the Bhagavatamrita mentions him as "an aged man without hair" (Noah was at that time 847 years of age), "with only two arms." Now, it is observable, that all the Avataras, when in power, are drawn with four arms; a convincing proof that this appearance was during his banishment. The works of Rhadacanta are on this, as on many other occasions, very unjustly quoted. Sir William Jones, wishing for an explanation of the Bhagavat, a classical book, which states the birth of ^{the same} ~~this~~ Buddha at the commencement of the Cali age, demands *written* proof of what might be considered as the commencement. The Bhagavatamrita was, therefore, produced. But that by no means warrants the assertion "that Rhadacanta insists that Buddha, the

son of **Maza**, of whom the astronomers of **Varanes** were treating, appeared after the thousandth year of the **Cali** age." The vast distance of **China** from the mountain, where the ark rested; the advanced age of the patriarch; his being seen at **Mugadha** **A. M.** 1902, all militate even against a supposition that he ever reached **China**: and the history of that country, if dates are attended to, renders it impossible that he should have done so. **Noah** of the **Hebrews**, **Vaivaswat** of the **Hindus**, and **Yau** of the **Chinese**, are each of them recorded, by the historians of their several countries, as being the first postdiluvian king, whose reign commenced one year from the commencement of the deluge; which event each of these historians places at **A. M.** 1656. The **Hebrews** place it in that year; the **Hindus** in the prophetic year 1680; and the **Chinese** in the **Cali** year 756, which answers to **A. M.** 1656: and, what is yet more remarkable, each of them limits his rule to one hundred years, naming a successor at that period. Now, as it is physically impossible, that the patriarch could have appeared in three places, at one and the same time, it is evident that **Noah** being the general stock from which all postdiluvian nations originated, each, with a vanity very excusable, made his own country the first seat of empire. Besides which, **Navaret** is of opinion that **China** was not peopled until an hundred and

thirty-one years after the ~~deluge~~ ^{deluge}; which appears probable, as it was about the period when new nations arose, owing to the confusion of tongues at Babel. And all the Chinese authors agree, that ~~Yau~~, the first Emperor of the first dynasty, did not begin his reign until the year B. C. 2207. Consequently, the *first Chinese Emperor* could not have been Yau or Noah.

The next, and last Buddha, recorded by the Hindus is Crishnu, or Moses. It is asserted that "Goverdhana of Cashmir, who had once said that Crishnu descended two centuries before Buddha, subsequently said that the Cashmirians admitted an interval of twenty-four years, and others only twelve, between these two divine personages*." Goverdhana either intended to mislead, or his account has been very erroneously transmitted. For on this subject he could not have been deceived. He well knew that this Buddha and Crishnu were the same. The error is easily cleared up; for our author adds: "the Brahmans who assisted Abulfuzi, in his curious but superficial account of his master's empire, informed him that, if the figures in the Ayini Akbari were correctly written, a period of 2962 years had elapsed, from the birth of Buddha to the fortieth year of Akbar's reign;

* Jones iv, 16.

which computation places his birth in the thirteen hundred and sixty-sixth year before the birth of our Saviour," answering to A. M. 2636. For $1366 + 1636 = 4002$. Now every learned Hindu knows that the secretary's account was calculated for the Cali year 4700, answering to A. M. 5600. Deducting therefore 2962 from 5600, the remainder is 2638. When this was shewn to Goverdhana, he replied with truth, that Crishnu descended two centuries before that period ($2638 - 200 = 2438$), and the Hebrew Scripture, which reckons on the year of Christ 4004, places the birth of Moses at A. M. 2433. Subsequently, when no comparison was drawn, Goverdhana, in general terms, informed Sir William Jones, that some placed his birth twelve years later, and others even twenty-four. This will be further illustrated by examining the account of the secretary of Akbar. "If, say the Brahmans, the numbers are correct." The Brahmans knew full well that they were not correct: for Abulfuzi calculated on the prophetic year of 360, and the Brahmans on the Savan year of 355 days. Of course there were only seventy divine ages in the Menwantara of the secretary. But the Brahmans, multiplying by seventy-one, said, "If the numbers were correct, 2962 years had elapsed to the fortieth year of Akbar's reign, in lieu of the first. Now $2438 \times 71 \div 70 = 2470$;

bringing the period to the fortieth year of the reign of Akbar, and placing the birth of Crishnu at A. M. 2430, which comes sufficiently near to an assertion, beyond controversy, that Crishnu and Moses were the same. We may draw a comparative statement of the Buddhas as follows :

1. Adam born B. C. . . 4004 . lived years 930.
Swayambhava 4002 . lived upwards of 900.
2. Enoch born B. C. 3381 . lived years 365.
The divine Buddha 3383 365½.
3. Noah born B. C. . . 2948 . lived years 950.
Vaivaswat 2946 { was seen at } 846 { year of his
Mugadha } death not
mentioned.
4. Moses born B. C. 1571 . lived years 120.
Crishnu 1575 . lived above 100.

The foregoing dates sufficiently correspond, to ascertain that the same persons were intended, although described by different names. And although the Hindus commonly make use of the word Buddha, to denote an illumination of the Deity, or prophet of the Lord, they always qualify the expression, so as to leave no doubt of the person intended. Of the Black Shepherd, Baldeus speaks as follows : “ If the sea was filled with ink, the earth with paper, and all the inhabitants of the terrestrial globe were employed in writing only,

they would not be sufficient to give an exact account of all the miracles wrought by Crishnu, during the space of an hundred years, in the third period of the world, *called the Dwaparajug.*" This missionary cannot divest himself of European ideas, when he treats of Hindu matters. No native could have introduced either pen, ink, or paper; but the missionary does not stop there. The Hindu historians record these miracles to have lasted "for an hundred years, during the middle of the third period of the world." Now the third period was the third thousandth year of the world, which the Hindus divide into six parts; considering each thousand years as a day of Brahma. Crishnu performed his miracles during the middle of the third period of the world, the third day of Brahma; and Moses during the middle of the third thousandth year of the world. But the missionary, when he converted the Cadjan, and iron pen, into ink and paper, carried the time of Crishnu back about 1700 years, making "the *third period* of the world the Dwapa, or *third age*," which commenced A. M. 700, and continued for two hundred years only. We may, then, venture to pronounce, that neither of the Buddhas celebrated by Sir William Jones, or by those who have followed him, were intended for Noah, the son of Lamech. The first was a *Budha*, a sage, not a prophet; Enoch, in

the race of Cain, the grandson of Adam, instead of Athothes or Mercury, whom the Goths call Woden, the grandson of Ham: and the latter was either a Tartar, or a Chinese; who, as the founder of a sect, which professed Atheism, very naturally gave offence to a people, whose religion was formed on the purest system of Ethics, founded on devotion to the Eternal God. Were it otherwise, to change the era, when the Cali age commenced, and deny the knowledge of the Hindus, relative to the antediluvian patriarchs, on the authority of four Chinese authors, said to place the birth of Foe at v. B. c. 1027; of Foe, an impostor, the founder of a sect, who denied the existence of pure spirit, and believed nothing absolutely and really to exist, but material substance; a religion, if such it can be called, to this day spoken of by the Brahmans, who tolerate all other religions, with "the malignity of intolerant spirits;" is just as reasonable, as it would be to alter the Christian era, or to deny the incarnation of the Messiah, because Richard Brothers and Johannah Southcot, assumed the title of prophets. Does the date of the Christian era rest on the birth of these two modern enthusiasts, who appeared for the edification of the age of reason? Most certainly not. Why, then, should the era of the Cali age be regulated by the birth of the Chinese impostor Foe! Yet on no

better ground rests the assertion, that the Indians
 are ignorant of the epoch from which they
 reckon time; that they have no certain chrono-
 logy of events, and that we may suspect the truth
 of all their relations: for their "received chrono-
 "logy begins with an absurdity so monstrous, as
 "to overthrow their whole system. For having
 "established their period of 71 divine ages, as the
 "reign of each Menu, yet thinking it incongruous
 "to place a holy person in times of impurity, they
 "insist, that the Menu reigns only in every golden
 "age, and disappears in the three human ages that
 "follow it, continuing to dive and emerge like a
 "water-fowl, till the close of his Menwantara. The
 "learned author of the *Puranarthapracasa*, which
 "I will now follow step by step, mentioned this ridi-
 "culous opinion with a serious face; but as he has
 "not inserted it in his works, we may take his
 "account of the *seventh* Menu, according to its
 "obvious and rational meaning, and suppose that
 "Vaivaswata, the son of Surya, the son of Casyapa
 "or Uranus, the son of Marichi, or, light, the son
 "of Brahma, which is clearly an allegorical pedi-
 "gree, reigned in the last golden age, or, according
 "to the Hindus, 3892888 years ago: but they
 "contend, that he actually reigned on earth
 "1728000 years of mortals, or 4800 years of the
 "Gods; and this opinion is another monster, so

“ repugnant to the course of nature and to human
 “ reason, that it must be rejected as wholly fabu-
 “ lous, and taken in proof, that the Indians know
 “ nothing of their Sun-born Menu but his name,
 “ and the principal event of his life: I mean the uni-
 “ versal deluge, of which the three first Avatars are
 “ merely allegorical representations, with a mix-
 “ ture, especially in the second, of the astronomical
 “ mythology. From this Menu the whole race of
 “ mankind is supposed to have descended. For the
 “ seven Rishis, who were preserved with him in the
 “ ark, are not mentioned as fathers of families; but
 “ since his daughter Ila was married, as the Indians
 “ tell us, to the first Budha, or Mercury, the son of
 “ Chandra, or the Moon, a male deity, whose father
 “ was Atri, son of Brahma. Here again we meet
 “ with an allegory purely astronomical or poetical.
 “ His posterity are divided into two great branches,
 “ called the children of the Sun, from his own sup-
 “ posed father; and the children of the Moon, from
 “ the parent of his daughter’s husband. The lineal
 “ male descendants, in both those families, are sup-
 “ posed to have reigned in the city of Ayodhya, or
 “ Audh, and Pratishthana, or Vitoria, respectively,
 “ till the thousandth year of the present age, and
 “ the names of *all* the princes in both lines, having
 “ been diligently collected by Rhadacanta, from
 “ several Puranas, I exhibit them in two columns,

"arranged by myself, with great attention." (Sir W. Jones, vol. iv, p. 22.

Before we proceed to the names of *all* the princes in both lines, let us examine the poem that precedes them. For should it appear on investigation, that those dynasties were antediluvian; that the princes, who form them, were destroyed by the deluge; and that their general father, their great sire, was created 4002 years before the Christian era: then it follows, that "*the Menu*, from whom the whole race of mankind is supposed to have descended, was" *not* "Noah." Had this author been true to his promise, and "followed the learned author of the *Purāṇarthaprakāśa* step by step," instead of giving that which he conceived to be his obvious and rational meaning, he had not asserted, that the princes, who sprang from the first Menu, whose Antara is placed at the first year of the creation, were postdiluvians. For, considering the divine age as it applies to the four human ones, or duration of the world, we have abundant proof, that the Menu, who is represented as the great sire, from whom descended the children of the Sun and Moon, could be no other than Adam. And so it appears from the account of Rhadacanta, as given by this author, who tells us, "*they* insist that *the Menu* reigns only in every golden age, and disappears in the three human

ages that follow it, continuing to dive and emerge like a water-fowl, till the close of his Menwantara." The ridicule attached to this account rests wholly with the "diving and emerging" monsters of European birth. We are told, that *they* insist. Who are intended by *they*? not the Hindus; for in no part of their records is it even intimated, that *the* Menu *only* reigns during the golden age, or 400 years: the Maha Menwantara, or 857 years being the Antara, or average life of a Menu*. Not in the writings of Rhadacanta; for our author adds, "*but as he has not* inserted it in his works, we may take his account of the *seventh* Menu, according to its obvious and rational meaning." Thus it follows that "*they who insist*" are European chronologists; who, not finding any thing in the works of Rhadacanta that warranted an assertion "that the Menu who ruled during the golden age was the prince saved in the ark," introduced the word *seventh*, as the *rational* meaning of an author who was treating of the *first* Menu, the *first* created, the general father of mankind, from whom the Solar and Lunar dynasties descended. Rhadacanta says *the* Menu, to denote his being the first and greatest; he then pro-

* The rule of a Menu is to the golden age as 3702240 to 1728000.

ceeds to give the actual year when this Menu was created, answering to the first year of the world; and further informs us, that Icshwacu, the first ruler of the Solar dynasty, was of the third generation, and did not commence his rule until after the first or golden age was past. For example: "the Menu began to reign 3892888 years ago." This account was given to Sir William Jones A. D. 1788. Here, one would have thought, scepticism itself should have been satisfied. Here, no key was required to the cypher: for A. D. 1788 answers to anno Cali 4890*; or, according to the calculations of this author, to the Cali year 4888; consequently, when he wrote the first, the second, the third, and 4888 years of the fourth age, were past: for $1728000 + 1296000 + 864000 + 4888 = 3892888$: which shews that the Menu who began his reign 3892888 years" before A. D. 1788, commenced his reign in the first year of the first age, which was the first year of the creation. Now, adding the nine hundred years, which the three first ages occupied, to the portion of the Cali, or fourth age, which was past; and supposing the Christian era to have commenced A. M. 4000, which we must do, to make the Cali year 4888 answer to A. D. 1788; then, adding the year of the world to

* Vide Appendix (A).

the year of Christ, the numbers agree : for $900 + 4888 = 5788$; and $4000 + 1788 = 5788$. But as the period specified *was the first year of the first age, the first year of time*, it matters not in respect to identifying the first Menu, whether it was 3892888 or 5788 years before the year of Christ 1788 : for, as it was the *first* year of the creation, neither the birth, nor the reign of the *seventh** Menu, could have been dated therefrom. Again, "The Hindus insist that he reigned the whole of the golden age." The Hindus record, that he ruled *uninterruptedly* during the whole of the first age, or age of virtue. It has been shewn, and will be yet more fully proved, that from the return of Cain, stated at A. M. 420, constant feuds existed in the old world ; and from that period, the commencement of the second age, the Hindus suppose one half of the world to have become corrupt, and that the virtues and vices were equal ; that is, that the number of Cainites, or idolaters, equalled the Sethites, or true believers. "But," adds our author, "they contend that he actually reigned on earth 1728000 years." A very limited capacity might discover, without the Hindus contending for

* The seventh Menu denotes the seventh in the race of the Sun, or Seth ; the seventh independent of Adam, who was chief of both lines.

it, that as the golden age consisted of that number of years; if the Menu reigned the whole of the golden age, that he must have reigned 1728000 years; which in truth was only four hundred. But Rhadacanta divides the period of the *undisturbed* rule, from the total period of his reign. The text says, “*the* Menu ruled undisturbed during the whole of the first age, and ended his mortal career when the third age was completely ended:” denoting that the first four hundred years of the rule of the first-created, was exempt from those feuds, which afterwards rent the old world, and finally brought on the deluge. These are the assertions of the Hindus, which are represented as proofs “that they know nothing of their Sun-born Menu but his name, and the principal event of his life, the universal deluge.” It is forgotten that, in the same tract, the same author recorded that “the Hindu writings were very diffuse on the life and posterity of their *seventh* Menu*,” whom this writer supposes to be Noah. Both these accounts cannot be true. Perhaps neither of them is so. The Arabs affect to know more of this patriarch than any other nation; but even their knowledge is very superficial. That the deluge was wholly unconnected with the Menu who was born 3892888

* See Letter I.

years before A. D. 1788 is certain; because he died at least seven hundred and twenty-five years before that event took place; and Sir William Jones, as we have seen, asserts that "from this Menu the whole race of mankind is supposed to have descended," proving that they were supposed to have descended from the first Menu or Adam: and it is observable that this author, who rests his whole argument on the name, Vaivaswata or Sun-born, informs us, in another tract (vol. III. p. 332.) that "the name of the seventh Menu was Satyavrata, whose *patronymic* name was Vaivaswata:" which is true; that being the *patronymic* of the whole race, and not assumed by this prince, until after the deluge; apparently to refute the Egyptian records found at Berytus, which implied that the other race had been preserved. Our author, presupposing, or determined, that this Menu should be Noah, to reconcile so palpable an absurdity; after stating that from him the *whole* race of men were believed to have descended, adds, "for the seven Rishis (saints) who were preserved with him in the ark, are not mentioned as fathers of families." Here we see the difficulty of supporting an hypothesis, which has not truth for its basis. This author, who tells us that the seven Rishis took their *wives* with them into the ark, that they were

named *Casyapa*, *Atri*, *Vasishrha*, *Viswametra*, *Gaulama*, *Jamadagni*, and *Bharatwayu*, that from *Atri* the Lunar, and from *Casyapa* the Solar race descended. For the purpose of supporting the absurd doctrine, that the Menu, who was created in the first year of the world, was the one taken into the ark, the same tract informs us, that the seven Rishis were *not fathers of families*. Every Hindu believes that the whole race of mankind descended from their first Menu: but no eastern nation attributes the peopling of the new world to one individual: it is most true, that the great saints *Maha-shees*, or precepts delivered by God in the early ages of the antediluvian world, and which the Almighty commanded to be taken into the ark, for the purpose of enlightening the postdiluvian world, were not considered fathers of families; but it is equally true, that the Hindus and Egyptians believe, that the chiefs of Brahmans "and attendants," which were taken by order of the Eternal into the ark, were so considered. And the Chaldeans particularize the *family* and *attendants* of *Sisuthrus*, or Noah, as the persons by whom the new world was peopled. That *Rhadacanta* might have said, that "the Menu reigned only in the golden age, and disappeared in the three human ages that followed;" is possible; because it appears an answer

to a specific question. For we are told, that "he mentioned this ridiculous opinion with a *serious face*;" it is evident therefore, that it was not found in his works: this opinion, no Hindu would have volunteered. But having said that the Antara of a Menu continued for seventy-one divine ages, and, as we were then in the 4888th year of the fourth mortal age of a divine age, probably he was asked, where is your Menu now? To such a question he could only answer "that *the* Menu was too sacred to reside in an age of sin;" in like manner as we answer children, when they propose questions, on which we deem it inexpedient to give information.

Having stated those circumstances which render it impossible that the princes of the Solar and Lunar dynasties could have descended from Noah, I insert their names with the comments, as given by Sir W. Jones (vol. IV. p. 24.)

SECOND AGE.

Children of the Sun.

Icshwacu.
Vicucshi.
Cucatstha.
Anenas.
5 Pritha.

Children of the Moon.

Budha.
Pururavas.
Ayush.
Nahusha.
Yayati. 5

Children of the Sun.	Children of the Moon.
Viswagandhi.	Puru.
Chandra.	Janamejaya.
Yuvasaswa.	Prachinwat.
Irava.	Pravira.
10 Urihadaswa.	Menasyu. 10
Dhundhumara.	Charupada.
Dridhaswa.	Sudyu.
Heryaswa.	Bahugava.
Nicummbha.	Sanyati.
15 Crisaswa.	Ahangati. 15
Senajit.	Raudraswa.
Yuvasaswa.	Riteyush.
Mandhatri.	Rantinava.
Puructsa.	Sumati.
20 Irasadasyu.	Aiti. 20
Anaranya.	Dushimanta.
Heryaswa.	Bharata.*
Praruna.	(Vitatha.
Trivindhana.	Manyu.
25 Satyavata.	Vrihateshetra. 25
Trisancu.	Hastin.
Harischandra.	Ajamidha.
Rohita.	Ricsha.
Harita.	Samwarana.
30 Champa.	Curu. 30
Sudeva.	Jahnu.
Yijaya.	Suratha.

Children of the Sun.

	Bharuca.
	Urica.
35	Bahuca.
	Sagara.
	Asamanjas.
	Ansumat.
	Bhagiratha.
40	Sruta.
	Naba.
	Sindhudwipa.
	Ayutayush.
	Ritaperna.
45	Saudasa.
	Asmaca.
	Mulaca.
	Dasaratha.
	Aidabidi.
50	Viswasaha.
	Chatwanga.
	Dirghabahu.
	Plaghu.
	Aja.
55	Dusaratha.
	Rama.

Children of the Moon.

	Viduratha.	
	Sarvabhauma.	
	Jayatsena.	35
	Rhadica.	
	Ayutayush.	
	Acrodhana.	
	Devalithi.	
	Nichsha.	40
	Dilipa.	
	Pratipa.	
	Santana.	
	Vichitraverya.	
	Pandü	45
	Yudishthir.)	

“ It is agreed among all the pundits, that Rama, their *seventh* incarnate *divinity*, appeared as king of Ayodhya, in the interval between the silver and the brazen ages ; and if we suppose him to have

begun his reign at the very beginning of that interval; still 3300 years of the Gods, or 1188000 lunar years of mortals, will remain in the silver age, during which the fifty-five princes, between Vaivaswata and Rama, must have governed the world. But reckoning thirty years for a generation, which is rather too much for a long succession of eldest sons, as they are said to have been, we cannot by the course of nature, extend the second age of the Hindus beyond 1650 solar years. If we suppose them not to have been eldest sons, and even to have lived longer than modern princes in a dissolute age, we shall find only a period of 2000 years: and if we remove the difficulty by admitting miracles*, we must cease to reason, and may as well believe at once whatever the Brahmans choose to tell us."

"In the Lunar pedigree, we meet with another absurdity, equally fatal to the credit of the system of the Hindus. As far as the twenty-second degree of descent from Vaivaswata, the synchronism of the two families appears tolerably regular; except that the children of the Moon were not all eldest sons; for king Yayati appointed the youngest of his five sons to succeed him in India, and allotted inferior kingdoms to the other four, who had of-

* Does this author mean to deny the existence of miracles? may not the argument be retorted by the Hindus?

fended him: part of the Dacshin, or the south, to Yadu, the ancestor of Crishnu; the north to And; the east to Druhya; and the west to Turvasu, from whom the pundits believe, or pretend to believe, in compliment to our nation, that we are descended*. But of the subsequent degrees in the Lunar line they know so little, that, unable to supply a considerable interval between Bharat and Vitatha, whom they call his son and successor, they are under a necessity of asserting, that the great ancestor of Yudhishtir actually reigned 27000 years, a fable of the same class with that of his wonderful birth, which is the subject of a beautiful Indian drama. Now, if we suppose his life to have lasted no longer than that of other mortals, and admit Vitatha and the rest to have been his regular successors, we shall fall into another absurdity; for then, if the generations in both lines were nearly equal, as they would naturally have been, we shall find Yudhishtir, who reigned confessedly at the close of the brazen age, nine gene-

* The Hindus believe with the Zabii, that the second *Mena* was the Egyptian Agathodæmon, the ancestor of Buddha, the son of Máyá. They likewise believe that Asclepiades, although under another name, was appointed to rule over the fourth part of the world: namely, the West, which after the deluge was termed Europe. The pundits believed that Turvasu ruled over that part of the world now occupied by Europeans; not that the postdiluvian Europeans descended from that prince.

rations older than Rama, before whose birth the silver age is allowed to have ended.* After the name of Bharat, therefore, I have set an asterisk, to denote a considerable chasm in the Indian history, and have inserted between brackets, as out of their places, his twenty-four successors, who reigned, if at all, in the following age, immediately before the war of the Mahabharat. The fourth Avatar, which is placed in the interval between the first and second ages, and the fifth, which soon followed it, appear to be moral fables, grounded on historical facts. The fourth was the punishment of an impious monarch by the Deity himself, bursting from a marble column, in the shape of a lion; and the fifth was the humiliation of an arrogant prince, by so contemptible an agent as a mendicant dwarf. After these, and immediately before Buddha, come three great warriors, all named Rama; but it may justly be made a question, whether they are not three representations of one person, or three different ways of relating the same history: the first and second Ramas are said to have been contemporary; but whether all, or

* If the silver age is allowed to have ended before the birth of Rama, how came this author to place his reign, as king of Ayedhya during that age? The fact is, Rama became a ruler during the second age, and the pundits all agree, that his reign did not commence until after the second age was concluded.

any of them, mean Rama, the son of Cush, I leave others to determine. The mother of the second Rama was named Caushalya, which is a derivative of Cushala; and though his father be distinguished by the title or epithet of Dasaratha, signifying that his war-chariots bore him to all quarters of the world, yet the name of Cush, as the Cashmirians pronounce it, is preserved entire in that of his son and successor, and shadowed in that of his ancestor, Vicushi; nor can a just objection be made to this opinion, from the nasal Arabian vowel in the word Ramah, mentioned by Moses, since the very word *Arab* begins with the same letter, which the Greeks and Indians could not pronounce; and they were obliged, therefore, to express it by the vowel which most resembled it. On this question, however, I assert nothing; nor on another, which might be proposed, whether the fourth and fifth Avatars be not allegorical stories of the two presumptuous monarchs Nimrod and Belus? The hypothesis, that government was first established, laws enacted, and agriculture encouraged in India by Rama, about 3800 years ago, agrees with the received account of Noah's death, and the previous settlement of his immediate descendants."

THIRD AGE.

Children of the Sun.		Children of the Moon.	
	Cusha.		
	Atithi.		
	Nishadha.		
	Nabhas		
5	Pundarica.		
	Cshemadhanwas.	Vitatha.	
	Devanica.	Manya.	
	Ahinagu.	Vrihatshetra.	
	Paripatra.	Hastin.	
10	Ranachhala.	Ajamidha.	5
	Vajranabha.	Ricsha.	
	Arca.	Samwarana.	
	Surgana.	Curu.	
	Vidhriti.	Jahnu.	
15	Hiranyanabha.	Suratha.	10
	Pushya.	Viduratha.	
	Dhruvasandhi.	Sarvabhauma.	
	Sudersana.	Jayatsena.	
	Agniverna.	Radhica.	
20	Sighra.	Ayutayush.	15
	Maru, supposed to be still alive. }	Acrodhana.	
	Prasusruta.	Devatithi.	
	Sandhi.	Ricsha.	

Children of the Sun.		Children of the Moon.	
	Amersana.		Dilipa.
25	Mahaswat.		Pratipa. 20
	Viswabhabhu.	•	Santanu.
	Prasenajit.		Vichitravürya.
	Tacshaca.		Pandu.
	Vrihadbala.		Yudhishtira.
30	Vrihadrana Y. B. C.	}	
	3100.		Paricshit. 25

“Here we have only nine and twenty princes of the Solar line between Rama and Vrihadrana exclusively, and their reigns, during the whole brazen age, are supposed to have lasted nearly 864000 years; a supposition evidently against nature, the uniform course of which allows only a period of eight hundred and seventy, or, at the very utmost, of a thousand years for twenty-nine generations. Paricshit, the great nephew and successor of Yudhishtir, who had recovered the throne from Duryodhan, is allowed, without controversy, to have reigned in the interval between the brazen and earthen ages, and to have died at the setting in of the Calijug; so that, if the pundits of Cashmir and Varanes have made a right calculation of Buddha's appearance, the present or fourth age must have begun about a thousand years before the birth of Christ, and consequently the

reign of Icshwacu could not have been earlier than four thousand years before that great epoch : and even that date will perhaps appear, when it shall be strictly examined, to be nearly two thousand years earlier than the truth. I cannot leave the third Indian age, in which the virtues and vices of mankind are said to have been equal, without observing, that even the close of it is manifestly fabulous and poetical, with hardly more appearance of historical truth than the Tale of Troy, or of the Argonauts : for, Yudhishtir, it seems, was the son of Dherma, the genius of Justice : Bhima of Pavan, or the God of Wind : Arjun of Indra, or the firmament; Nacul and Sahadeva, of the two Cumars, the Castor and Pollux of India ; and Bishma, their reputed great uncle, was the child of Ganga, or the *Ganges*, by Santanu, whose brother Devapi is supposed to be still alive, in the city of Calapa : all which fictions may be charming embellishments of an heroic poem, but are just as absurd in civil history, as the descent of two royal families from the Sun and the Moon."

FOURTH AGE.

Children of the Sun.

Urucriya.

Vatsavridha.

Prativyoma.

Children of the Moon.

Janamejaya.

Satanica.

Sahaaranica.

Children of the Sun.	Children of the Moon.
Bhanu.	Aswamedhaja.
5 Devaca.	Asimacrishna. 5
Sahadeva.	Nemichacra.
Vira.	Upta.
Vrihadaswa.	Chitraratha.
Bhanumat.	Suchiratha.
10 Praticswa.	Dhritimat. 10
Supratika.	Sushena.
Marudeva.	Sunitha.
Sunacshatra.	Nrichacshuh.
Pushcara.	Suchinata.
15 Antaricsha.	Pariplava. 15
Sutapas.	Sunaya.
Amitrajit.	Medhavin.
Vrihadraja.	Nripanjaya.
Barhi.	Derva.
20 Critanjaya.	Timi. 20
Rananjaya.	Vrihadratha.
Sanjaya.	Sudasa.
Slocya.	Satanica.
Suddhoda.	Durmadana.
25 Langalada.	Rahinara. 25
Prasenajit.	Dandapani.
Cshudraca.	Nimi.
Sumitra, Y. B. C. 2100.	Cshemaca.

"In both families we see thirty generations reckoned, from Yudhishtir, and from Vrihadbala,

his contemporary, who was killed in the war of Bharat, by Abhimanyu, son of Arjun, and father of Paricshit, to the time when the Solar and Lunar dynasties are believed to have become extinct in the present divine age ; and for these generations the Hindus allot a period of one thousand years only, or a hundred years for three generations ; which calculation, though probably too large, is yet moderate enough compared with their absurd account of the preceding ages ; but they reckon exactly the same number of years, for twenty generations only in the family of Jarasandha, whose son was contemporary with Yudhishtir, and founded a new dynasty of Princes in Magadha or Bahar : and this exact coincidence of the time in which the three are supposed to have been extinct, has the appearance of an artificial chronology, formed rather from imagination, than from historical evidence ; especially as twenty kings, in an age comparatively modern, could not have reigned a thousand years. I nevertheless exhibit the list of them as a curiosity ; but am far from being convinced, that all of them ever existed ; that, if they did exist, they could not have reigned more than seven hundred years, I am fully persuaded by the course of nature, and the concurrent opinion of mankind."

KINGS OF MAGADHA.

Sahadeva.	Suchi.	
Marjari.	Cshema.	
Srutasravas.	Suvrata.	
Ayutayush.	Dermasutra.	
5 Niramitra.	Srama.	15
Sunacshatra.	Drid'hasena.	
Vrihetsena.	Sumati.	
Carmajit.	Subala.	
Srutanjaya.	Sunita.	
10 Vipra.	Satyajit.	20

"Puranjata, son of the twentieth king, was put to death by his minister, Sunaca, who placed his own son, Pradyato, on the throne of his master: and this revolution constitutes an epoch of the highest importance in our present inquiry; first, because it happened according to the Bhagavatamrita, two years exactly before Buddha's appearance in the same kingdom: next, because it is believed by the Hindus to have taken place 3888 years ago,* or 2100 years before Christ; and lastly, because a regular chronology, according to the number of years in each dynasty, has been established from the accession of Pradyato to the

* Before A. D. 1788.

subversion of the genuine Hindu government ; and that chronology I will now lay before you, after observing only, that Rhadacanta himself says nothing of Buddha in this part of his work, though he particularly mentions the two preceding Avatars in their proper place."

KINGS OF MAGADHA.

Pradyato, Y. B. C. 2100.

Palaca.

Visac'hayupa.

Rajaca.

Nandiverdhana, 5 reigns = 138 years.

Sisunaga, Y. B. C. 1962.

Cacaverna.

Cshemadherman.

Cshetrajnya.

Vidhesara.

Ajatasatru.

Dharbhaca.

Ajaya.

Nandiverdhana.

Mahanandi, 10 reigns = 360 years.

Nanda, Y. B. C. 1602.

"This prince, of whom frequent mention is made in the Sanscrit books, is said to have been

murdered, after a reign of one hundred years, by a very learned and ingenious, but passionate and vindictive Brahman, whose name was Chatacya, and who raised to the throne a man of the Maurya race, named Chandragupta. By the death of Nanda and his sons, the Chatriya family of Pradyato became extinct."

Such are the comments of Sir William Jones, on the genealogy of the Hindus, as furnished by Rhadacanta, and which I have followed so far as the year B. C. 1502, as comprehending the life of the last Buddha: and these observations I have given at large, because, if we refute them, the arguments brought forwards by minor authors will deserve little attention.

Had the dynasties of the Sun and Moon been postdiluvian, it is impossible that, in an account so circumstantial as that given by Rhadacanta, the princes who ruled during the first age, should have been omitted. But considering them as antediluvian, the seeming omission is correct. For we have seen, that during the first age *Menu ruled alone*. No feuds had then commenced: but, at the setting in of the second age, a different system became necessary; the race of Atri returned, and then two dynasties arose; until which time the children of the Sun inhabited the Holy City, with their great sire, as one family; all was unity and peace.

Now let us, for a moment, suppose, with those who adopt the new system of ancient mythology, agreeing with its learned author, that the first year denoted the first year after the deluge, and that all historic record commenced from that epoch. Considering Noah as the first of men, and consequently the Solar and Lunar dynasties as the offspring of that patriarch, let us examine whether it is possible to reconcile dates with that hypothesis. In the Chronological Table under consideration, it is asserted that fifty-six princes reigned in succession during the second age, and thirty during the third; making an aggregate of eighty-six reigns, the last of which, according to this author, ended y. B. C. 3100, or A. M. 902: and as these are reckoned by the years that had elapsed between that epoch and the birth of Christ, there can be no error in respect to the numeration. Now these are said by Europeans, to have descended in a line of eldest sons, from Cush, the son of Ham, whom, as the contemporary of Selah (who was born A. M. 1694), we cannot place further back; since our author asserts, that his father was not born until after the flood. In which case, no less than eighty-six generations descended from Cush 792 years before he was born; and the last of these eighty-six *postdiluvian* princes ended his reign 751 years *before the deluge*. Giving the

greatest possible latitude, and supposing Cush to have been born the year after the deluge, still, according to Sir W. Jones, these eighty-six generations were born, reigned, and died 756 years before the birth of their progenitor. And, if we add, the twenty-eight princes, said to have ruled during the beginning of the fourth age, we have 114 reigns in succession of eldest sons, lineally descended from Cush, (whom we will suppose to have been born the year after the deluge) until the period when the Solar and Lunar dynasties became extinct in the year B.C. 2100. This gives us the most prolonged period that can be admitted, or 756 years for 114 generations; which allows only six years and two hundred and twenty-seven days, not for the reign only of each prince, but for his birth, marriage, birth of his son, reign and death. We may defy the Hindus to produce an absurdity more monstrous than this, which is given for the purpose of elucidating their chronology: whilst that given by themselves is deemed "an absurdity so *monstrous* as to overthrow their whole system." Whence does our author produce 114 generations? If we reckon from Noah to the year B.C. 2100, we find but ten of the eldest sons inclusive of the patriarch and his son, who was born in the antediluvian world. For Haran the eldest son of Terah was not born until A. M. 1949, nearly half

a century after: which evinces, that the names of the princes ought not to have been placed in succession. For, if we take the greatest possible latitude, or from the commencement of the world to A. M. 1902, only nineteen generations of eldest sons in succession are recorded in the race of Seth during that period. That the Hindus should represent the dynasties, as princes in succession, may seem to Europeans very possible. For although their Puranas prove that there were only ten generations of patriarchs, seven of whom were considered supreme sovereigns before the deluge; yet, contending that the second and third age contained 2160000 years, they might deem it expedient to represent the princes who ruled over provinces as kings in succession; that the number of the princes might bear some proportion to the number of suppositious years, which they are said to have ruled. And these rulers over districts probably were termed kings, like those who served twelve years under Chedorlaomer in the time of Abraham, or Bera king of Sodom, Birsha king of Gomorrhah, and so forth. It is said that the children of the Sun were no other than the children of Cush, the grandson of Noah. Yet, when this dynasty, which is said to have consisted of 114 princes in succession, ended in A. M. 1900, Noah was still alive; and Cush, so far from being

the founder of so extensive a dynasty, was removing, with part of his family, from his first habitation, to the south of Babylon; to a place called Chaduca but formerly Chusca. So says the sacred writ of the Hebrews. Yet thence it has been inferred, that the children of the Sun were the children of Cush; and this name has been produced as a collateral proof of the truth of the remarks made on the derivation of names given in p. 147. The Hindus, in treating of the earliest times, place the residence of the first Menu in the province of Cueshedeas; naming the holy land Casi: the fifth Menu is designated in their sacred writings Cha'eshusha, or 'beaming with glory.' In the Puranas, the return of the race of Atri at the beginning of the fifth century of the world, or between four and five hundred years after the Padma creation is said to have been to the city of Casi, or the splendid, in the province of Cueshedeas, by the Egyptians called Crusi, and Cussidea, probably the same name differently spelt. May we not then presume, that Vicucshi and Cucutst'ha were rather derived from the Hindu Cha'eshusha than the Hebrew Cush? Maurice enlarges on the subject. In the 259th page of his second volume, he comments on the account of Sir W. Jones, or rather endeavours to enforce the truth of his statements, by saying, "Vaivasvat or

Menu we have seen as the fountain of both dynasties, who were Icshwacu, Vicucshi, Cucutst'ha and their descendants ; amounting to fifty-five princes down to Rama in the solar line. Their names and history, under the title Cush, and Cushites, given as far as was practicable in the preceding pages, have, I trust, satisfactorily evinced, that they were the more immediate and *noble* descendants male, of the great Satyavrata : they were the first colonizers of the world, though their exploits are detailed in the Puranas, in a style the most exaggerated, and in a manner the most romantic. It is those of the Lunar dynasty with whom we are now principally concerned, those who were the offspring of Buddha, the planet Mercury, by Ila the daughter of the personage who was saved in the Bahitron, or ark, Noah, called Ilus by Sanchoniatho. Of the third in this dynasty Nuhusha (if indeed he were not the same as Rama himself*) the exploits have been amply detailed."

Here our commentator seems lost in a labyrinth of learning. For, following Mr. Bryant, he ~~makes~~ Vicucshi the son of Cush (who certainly

* M. Maurice places Nuhusha the third in the dynasty of the Moon, and Rama the fifty-fifth in the dynasty of the Sun ; although he here supposes them to be the same person.

was the third in descent from Noah) and following Sir William Jones, admits that fifty-five generations passed between the son of Cush and Rama; who he tells us, was likewise a son of Cush, for he could be no other than the Raamah of Scripture. "For the mother of the second Rama was named Caushalya, which is a derivative of Cush' Ala, and the name of Cush, as the Cashmirians pronounce it, is preserved intire in that of his ancestor Vicucshi." It sounds as harsh to a Christian, as to an Hindu ear, that the race of Ham, the accursed of his father, should be represented as the most noble descendants male of the great patriarch, the reformer of religion, the opposer of idolatry; the favoured of the lord Heri, the Eternal Spirit. And, lest we should suppose the Hindus to be ignorant of the character of this most *noble* and *favoured* son of Noah, the same author farther informs us, "that according to the Hindu record, Noah assigned to his son Jyapeti or Japheth, the regions to the north of Caucasus; to Sherma, or Shem, that to the south; but to Charma, or Ham, no portion of the world was allotted: he, in consequence of his vicious conduct, was doomed to be the slave of his brothers." His dereliction of virtue is then detailed. We are told that he found his father in an unseemly posture in a state of inebriety; a tale evidently borrowed

from the Jews, and which it would be very difficult to persuade an Hindu to believe. For the Hindus consider the curse entailed on the posterity of Ham by the Almighty, to have been in consequence of their dereliction of the Sacred writings. This author collected his names from Mr. Wilford. But where he found them in the postdiluvian world, it is difficult to say. Japetus is certainly a Grecian name, and is as such introduced in the great Titanian war of the old world. Of Sherma and Charma, Maurice informs us, that from the latter descended the great tribe of Khettri or Kuttri, which he renders Cuthites or Cushites; and he proceeds to inform us, that "the Cuthite line of Charma having by force of arms, seized upon the portion of the Shermites or children of Shem, the deity descended in the form of Parasa Rama*, and totally destroyed the Kustri or Cushite race of Charma;" and this transaction he places prior to the year B. C. 3100; independent of which, as he has no hesitation in pronouncing Rama of the seventh Avatar to be the same with Parasa, and each to represent Raamah of Scripture, Raamah the son of Cush, his elaborate comment goes

* Para denotes 'holy, free from sin.' The passage alluded to, denotes the hostilities between the dynasties of the Sun and Moon; the Shermites being the descendants of Seth not Shem.

to prove, that the Deity became incarnate in the son Raamah, to destroy the father Cush, and the whole Cushite or Kuttri race; a race which he just before "trusted he had satisfactorily evinced were the most immediate and noble descendants of the great Satyavrata." A race so virtuous, that the Deity deigned to become incarnate therein, for the purpose of instructing mankind in the rudiments of *virtue* and *piety*, both by precept and example. Should we get over this incongruity, we must have recourse to the system of metempsychosis, to people Ethiopia; for if we give credit to our own Scripture, we find the Cushites, which we translate Ethiopians, who were near the Arabians, concerned in the revolt of the Philistines, so late as the year B. C. 893; which was at least 2200 years after Mr. Maurice destroyed the whole Kuttri or Cushite race together with their sire, Cush the son of Charma or Ham; Ham being supposed by him, to be an abbreviation of Cham*, and Cham an abbreviation of Charma.

It is extraordinary that two authors, each of whom commences by affirming the genealogical table of the Sun and Moon to be fabulous, should

* Cham is the name given by the Chinese, to the eldest son of the First Created.

severally endeavour to produce arguments to prove from that very genealogy, that the Hindus sprang from that son of Noah, whom they are known to hold in utter abhorrence for having introduced human sacrifices, and a system totally incompatible with, and subversive of, their religion and mild institutions. We must, therefore, suppose, however these authors ridicule and decry the Solar and Lunar dynasties, that a latent spark existed in their minds, proving the truth of the genealogy, which they were unable to explain. The one who affirms, that "the dynasties of the Egyptians were like the children of the Sun and Moon of the Hindus, either the revolutions of celestial bodies, or owing their origin to oriental vanity and fiction," has no hesitation in asserting in direct opposition to the belief of the Hindus, that Icshwacu, who appears at the head of the Solar dynasty, "was the first of Noah's posterity known in India: for that partly in his own name, but more particularly in those of his two sons, and successors in the Indian empire, Vicucshi and Cucutst'ha, we recognise the first great Patriarch's family of Sacred Writ; after the most distinguished chief of which, the whole country was called Cush'a Dwapa." And then, as if to render the text yet more obscure, he states, that, "if the progeny of this Menu were not wholly allegorical,

they were antediluvian, for Christmu being the Apollo of India, was doubtless *Jubal*, the son of *Lamech* of the race of *Cain*: for the Scripture states Jubal as the father of all such as handle the harp and organ*;" thereby destroying that which he represents as the most noble race from Noah, together with their incarnate God, by the general deluge. We may safely defy any nation in the known world to surpass this in absurdity. The arguments brought forward by the other (Sir William Jones) are not less exceptionable. For, after comparing the whole genealogy, to the tales of Troy, and of the Argonauts, he boldly pronounces the epoch at which the Cali age is fixed, to be misplaced; furnishing three tables with a view to prove those, he had termed *visionary* dynasties, to be the descendants of Noah; and the children of the Sun, the offspring of Cush; and, after telling us, that the pedigree of Yudhishtir was "just as absurd in civil history, as the descents of the two regal families from the Sun and Moon," informs us, that the successor of Yudhishtir the contemporary of Vrihadbala the ~~twenty~~ ninety-ninth in descent from Rama, and eighty-fifth from Icshwacu, whom he believes to be the son of Cush "is allowed *without controversy* to have reigned between the

* Maurice, vol. I. p. 433.

brazen and earthen ages, and to have died at the setting in of the the Cali age. So that if the pundits have made a right calculation of Buddha's appearance, that period, or fourth age, must have began about a thousand years before the birth of Christ, and, consequently the reign of Icshwacu." Cush, the son of Noah, "could not have been earlier than four thousand years before that great epoch." Now it is observable, that the Hindus do not pretend that the reign of this prince commenced at so early an epoch as the year B. C. 4000. On the contrary, they suppose him to have become a ruler over a province at the beginning of the second age, which commenced 3602 years before Christ; and to have become a Menu more than a century after the Cali age began. So that the reign of Icshwacu is not even supposed by the Hindus to have began earlier than the year B. C. 2950, when he succeeded Swarochisa and assumed the name or epithet of Auttama. Swarochisa was the son of the first created, named Swayambhuva; Seth the son of the first created, named Adam: Icshwacu as Auttama succeeded Swarochisa: Enos succeeded Seth, and became a sovereign in succession in A. M. 1043, which was forty years more than a century after the Cali age began. So that according to the calculations of the pundits, and the astronomers at Varanes, neither *Buddha* nor

Budha, made his appearance about a thousand years before the birth of Christ. And the pundits of Cashmir very correctly place the birth of the postdiluvian Buddha two centuries before A. M. 2638, or in the year ^{B.C.} 1564. We must be careful not to confound *Buddha* with *Budha*. The first denotes a prophet, and is, I believe, exclusively applied to the descendants of the Sun: Buddha the son of Mâyâ, celebrated by the astronomers at Varanæs was Enoch: Buddha the son of Jina who was born in the 156th year of the Cali age was Noah, who was born in the 1056th year of the world. For $900 + 156 = 1056$. We may certainly consider the fourth year of any century as the commencement thereof; and 156 years are to 5100, as 3 years and 21 days are to a century. Budha, the contemporary of Icshwacu was a sage, or philosopher of the Lunar race: whether he ever succeeded to the government of the world appears doubtful; as Yayati of the same generation, is admitted by all the pundits to have succeeded to the supreme rule. If Budha ever became a Menu, his reign commenced about the fifty-seventh year of the Cali age or year B. C. 3045.

Having endeavoured to refute the foregoing arguments, brought forward against the Hindu Chronology, and to point out the absurdities and contradictions attending the postdiluvian system,

it remains to place the genealogy of the two dynasties in a less questionable form. That they did exist is most certain: that the names and dates, with one exception, are correct, I have no doubt. In the division which I am about to offer, it will appear that the children of the Sun, denote the race of Seth, and those of the Moon, the race of Cain. That these dynasties are considered by the Hindus as antediluvian has never, I believe, been disputed. All their sacred records so inform us. When history is transmitted in allegory, we must in general be at the trouble of searching for truth. But, in this instance, we are not only informed from whom Icshwacu and Budha descended, but of the year in which the Antara of their great sire, the general father of mankind commenced. That epoch is fixed at the first year of the first age; and it is added, that this Menu had two distinguished sons, from whom the Solar and Lunar dynasties descended. We may always draw valuable inferences from Hindu records. For instance, we learn that the princes in the two dynasties were antediluvian, because in the Veda, where the futility of all sublunary happiness is enforced, the deaths of the kings in each dynasty are recorded prior to the deluge. One passage is as follows:

“What relish can there be for enjoyment in

this world? Surely we see the universe tending to decay; even as the biting gnats and other insects; even as the grass of the field, and the trees of the forest, which spring up and then perish.

“ But what are they? Others far greater have been destroyed, archers mighty in battle, and some who have been *kings* of the *whole* earth: Sudhumna, Buridhumna, Indradhumna, Cuvalayaswa, Barishsha, Nahusha, Suryati, Yayati, Vicrava, Acshayasena, Pryavrata, and the rest.

“ Maratta, likewise, and Bharatta, who enjoyed all corporeal delights, yet left their boundless prosperity, and passed from this world to the next.

“ But what are they? Others, yet greater, Gandevas, Asuras, Rashesas, companies of spirits, Pisachas, Uragas, and Grahas have, we see, been destroyed.

“ But what are they? Others greater still have been changed, vast rivers dried, mountains torn up; the pole* itself turned from its place; the cords of the stars rent asunder, the earth itself deluged with water, even the Suses, or angels, hurled from their stations.

“ In such a world, then what relish can there be for enjoyment? Thou alone, O God, art able to raise up: Thou only, O Lord, art my refuge.”

* Vide Appendix (C).

In the foregoing we trace the death of the greatest heroes. And those, who in the Lunar dynasty became sovereigns of the whole world, Yayati and Bharata are particularized; but even greater than them, the seven Menus, well versed in the Scripture, commencing with the Gandevas, or patriarchs, paid the death of nature. All this took place prior to the destruction of the world by the deluge. It is evident, then, that the princes previously destroyed were antediluvian. In the new world, Noah only was sovereign of the whole earth; for on the division of the world three several rulers were appointed, independent of the patriarch: which again proves that *the kings* of the *whole* world were antediluvian. The Puranas then proceed to inform us, that Icshwacu, was descended from Marisha, or Light, who was the son of the Sun. In the Scripture we read, "And to Seth there was born a son, and he called his name Enos (or Enosh); then began men to call upon the name of the Lord." In the Hebrew, *to call themselves* by the name of the Lord. Thus Icshwacu, of the third generation from Swayambhuva, was termed the son of Light, or *righteous** race, the *higher light*, the Moon; and the other to distinguish

* Righteousness, at the same period that Enos of the third generation from Adam, was called by the name of the Lord: the *same* to distinguish the righteous race from the less righteous.*

the children of the true believers, from the children of the unbelievers, or idolaters. Agreeably to this, the dynasties commence at the period, when the two descendants, or eldest sons respectively of Seth and Cain, were of an age to become rulers, under the monarchical rule of their general father Adam. The Mahabharat places this period after 400 years; the Metsya Avatar at A. M. 419; Berossus at A. M. 413. But these three dates, denote the return of the race of Atri. For the commencement of the rule of the race of Atri, at Sipora, or Chaldea is specifically placed at A. M. 474, (as will be explained hereafter*). In dividing the dynasties, I have followed the Hindus. Supposing them the descendants of six generations only, commencing with Enos, and ending with Methuselah, placing with them their brothers as their contemporaries; that is, admitting Ieshwacu to denote Enos, I imagine the twenty-four names that follow to be equally the sons of Seth and rulers over provinces during the same period; placing the twenty-fifth prince Satyavata, at the head of the fourth generation, as Ieshwacu is admitted to be of the third.

I am far from presuming that the division is absolutely correct. The system that governs it,

* Vide Letter IV.

I am convinced, is so: and I have endeavoured so to explain the system by which dates are recorded, that those who have an opportunity of referring to original documents, may be enabled with ease to correct those errors, which it has cost me much pain to avoid, but of which I may nevertheless have been guilty.

In favour of the pedigree being postdiluvian, it will, I am aware, be urged that those European authors who have treated on the subject all agree that Budha of the Lunar dynasty married the daughter of Noah, the prince who was saved in the ark. This is true. But it is equally so, that the belief is confined to Europeans only. For the Hindu records expressly state, that Ila was the daughter of that Menu, from whom the whole world was peopled, whose Antara commenced with the Lotos creation just 3888000 suppositious years, equal to 900 years, before the commencement of the Cali age. But finding an account of the Menu from whom the Solar and Lunar dynasties descended in the works of Sir William Jones, Europeans in general, without taking the trouble to examine the Hindu account, or attending to dates, very boldly assert that Ila was the daughter of Noah. Whereas it has been proved from the account, as given by this author, that the Menu of whom Rhadacanta was treating, was born just 3892888 years

before he wrote. Sir William wrote in the 4888th year of the Cali age, answering to A. D. 1788, and therefrom placing the Antara, which he calls the reign of this Menu, in the first year of the creation. And then tells us, that Ila who married Budha, was his daughter, and consequently the daughter of Adam.

TABLE VII. PART I.

SECOND AGE.

SWAYAMBHUYA OR ADAM.

Casyapa or Seth.

Atri or Cain.

Sons of Casyapa who
descended from Light.

Sons of Atri.

Icshwacu * . . . Enos †.

Budha . . . Enoch.

Vicucshi.

Pururavas.

Cucutstha.

Ayush.

Anenas.

Nabusha.

Prithu.

Yayati.

Viswagandhi.

Puru.

Chandra.

Janamejaya.

Yuvanaswa.

Prachinwat.

Srava.

Pravira.

* Became ruler of a province about A. M. 426.

† Born A. M. 236.

*Sons of Casyapa who
descended from Light.*

Vrihadaswa.
Dhundhumara.
Dridhaswa.
Heryaswa.
Nicumbha.
Crisaswa.
Senajit.
Yuvanaswa.
Mandhatri.
Purucutsa.
Trasadasya.
Anaranya.
Heryaswa.
Praruna.
Trivindhana.

Sons of Atri.

Menasyu.
Charupada.
Sudyu.
Bahugava.
Sanyati.
Ahanyati.
Raudraswa.
Riteyush.
Nantinava.
Sumati.
Aiti.

Here commences the interval or chasm in the Lunar pedigree, which we have just seen represented as fatal, not only to Hindu chronology, but to Hindu history in general: as an absurdity sufficient to overthrow their whole system. An unprejudiced mind, however, will consider it as a collateral proof of the truth and accuracy of the Hindu records. For, in nearly all antediluvian accounts, the same omission of two generations occurs; in our Scripture, which ever text we follow,

the contemporaries of Cainan and Mahalaleel are omitted; the Hebrew text is as follows.

TABLE VIII.

ADAM.

Seth.	Cain.
Enos.	Enoch.
Cainan.	
Mahalaleel.	
Jared.	Irada.
Enoch.	Mehujael.
Methuselah.	Methusael.
Lamech.	Lamech.
Noah.	Jabal and Jubal. } Children of
	Jubal, Cain and } Lamech by
	Naamah. } two wives.

The Hebrew text of our Bible not only omits the two generations, but speaks of Irada in a style very different to that used when his posterity are spoken of. It is not recorded that Enoch begat Irada: which would have been the phrase used, if he had been his son; but that "unto Enoch was born Irada*," which is equally, if not more, applicable to the third or fourth generation, than to the next. For when the generations follow

* Gen. iv. 18.

without interruption, we read in the same verse "Irada begat Mehujael, and Mehujael begat Methusael, and Methusael begat Lamech;" evincing that Irada was not the son of Enoch, although he descended from him. The Arabians have a similar omission of two generations. One author, to make the age of Lamech accord with the legend which he relates, places Lamech the son of Methusael as the contemporary of Enoch, the son of Jared, of the race of Seth, and informs us, that Cain, being old and weary of the world, continually haunted by the reflection of the murder of Abel, was in the habit of retiring to the jungles, far from the haunts of men. That Lamech, being likewise advanced in years and very bad-sighted, was accompanied in his field sports by a youth, who hearing a rustling among the bushes, occasioned, as he supposed, by a wild beast, directed the arm of his master towards the spot from whence the sound issued; who, drawing his bow, pierced the heart of his great sire. Shocked at the crime of parricide, in the moment of despair, he seized a stone and killed the youth who had directed his arm towards the fatal spot, and on his return home: said unto his wives Adah and Zillah; "Hear my voice, ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech: for I have slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt." I do not contend

for the truth of this legend, and have only introduced it to prove that the Arabians record only four patriarchs in the race of Cain, between that prince and Lamech : which agrees both with the Hebrew and Hindu history. And, as the ancient Arabs, I do not mean the sons of Ishmael, trace their origin from the same stock with the Hindus, (Shem the son of Noah) ; an incident so material as the omission of two generations out of ten of the antediluvian patriarchs, ought rather to raise our admiration, than provoke our ridicule ; more particularly as it is confirmed by our own Scripture.

King Yayati who was of the third generation from the first created inclusive, in the race of Atri or Cain, is said by Rhadacant to have disinherited his four elder sons and banished them to distant regions ; and to have been succeeded by his youngest son Dushmanta : Now it is observable that between Yayati and Dushmanta, Rhadacant places fifteen names ; which proves, beyond controversy, that these princes were the brothers, and contemporaries of Yayati, the offspring of Atri or Cain, as placed in the preceding table, and rulers over provinces, at the same period of time. That Dushmanta succeeded his father Yayati as sovereign of the world may be true. But the reason here assigned for it is very erroneous. We have seen that, with

the exception of this prince, the whole of the fourth and fifth generations of patriarchs are omitted; probably, because they remained in that country to which their ancestor fled, after the murder of Abel. For although the Hebrews alone record the departure of Cain, yet as all the rest mark the period of the return of that race, their absence is implied. Our Scripture records, that "Cain went forth from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden, and he builded a city, and called the name of the city after the name of his son, Enoch*." It is a natural inference, that when Cain, with a part of his descendants, returned to the valley, where Abel was murdered, which according to the Eastern legends was the seat of government named Casi, or the splendid, a part of his family remained behind to inhabit those cities, and cultivate those lands, which had been given them as an heritage; among whom we may suppose the four eldest sons of Yayati: Dushmanta, the youngest, having probably been born after the return of his father, succeeded to regal power. Rhadacant, who copied from the records of Pradyato, of course omitted a circumstance so degrading, as the expulsion of Cain, and therefore accounted for the succession

* Gen. iv. 16, 17.

of the youngest son, by the disobedience of his elder brothers *; and, to make it more palatable to Europeans, flattered their vanity by supposing them to have descended from a branch of that family. But, what is of yet more consequence, Sir William Jones supposes, on this authority, that Crishnu descended from the eldest son of Yayati. Here our author blends Crishnu with Buddha, the son of Máya, who, in an incarnate form, is represented in the sixth Avatar, as Parasa. This prince did actually descend from the house of Yayati, but whether from Yada the eldest son, I will not pretend to determine. But, according to the Hindus, the great Dasaratha, the fourth in descent of the Solar race married a princess of the Lunar dynasty of the house of Yayati; the issue of which mar-

* If Turasa the fourth son of Yayati was one of these princes whom the Zabii believed to have been instructed by the first Hermes, who directed men in the religion of the living God during the third age, (vide note, p. 145.) it is probable, that his three eldest brothers likewise became converts to the divine religion revealed by Buddha the son of Máya in the incarnate form of Parasa Rama the first Hermes of the Egyptians. In which case, the expression "they were set aside in consequence of their disobedience" appears correct. It is certain that the Egyptian historians admit, that the fourth supreme ruler in the race of Cain was not the legal heir: and according to the Hindu historians, Dushmanta, who was the fourth sovereign of the world, in the race of Atri, ruled over that dynasty, which by legal inheritance, should have devolved to Yata. Sanchianutho supposes the next generation of kings to have been illegitimate.

riage was Rama Chandra, the Jared of Scripture. Therefore if I am correct, in supposing Enoch to have been the incarnate God of the Hindus, then was he lineally descended in the female line from Yayati*. The fifth generation is wholly omitted, and Bharatta who was equidistant from the first created with Irad (the Agreus of Sanchoniatho) is equally recorded "to have come after much time." This prince is said to have succeeded his grandfather; in like manner as Berosus supposes Anadaphus of the Chaldeans to have succeeded his grandfather Daus, and as we know Methuselah to have succeeded his grandfather Jared. And this omission of a generation, when the son is supposed to have died before the father, is a strong corroborative proof of the truth of the record. For such an occurrence could never have entered into a fictitious narrative: Thus it appears, that the omission in the pedigree confirms the Mosaic account, instead of oversetting that of the Hindus :

* If Crishnu has not been mistaken for Parasa Rama, Rhadacanta could only intend that Crishnu was born in that country, which before the deluge was governed by Yada. In like manner as he informs us that the Europeans came from that country, which before the deluge was assigned to ~~Turvash~~ Turvash because the same historian, in the same tract, places Dushmanta the younger brother of Yada fifty degrees in consanguinity before Paricshit; whose rule he places 3100 years before Christ, placing the birth of Crishnu in the year B. C. 1574.

and consequently that the following comment is as illiberal as unjust: "Of the subsequent degrees in the Lunar line, they know so little, that unable to supply a considerable interval between Bharatta and Vitch'ha, whom they call his son and successor, they are under the necessity of asserting that the great ancestor of Yudhishtir actually reigned seven and twenty thousand years, a fable of the same class with that of his wonderful birth."

The great ancestor of Yudhishtir was Yayati, between whom and Bharatta two generations in the legal succession are omitted; a circumstance, which is explained by Sanchoniatho; who, in recording the ten antediluvian generations, admits the princes of the fourth to have been usurpers, and these of the fifth illegitimate. Manetho, likewise, represents the fifth dynasty as of Elephantine or Solar kings. It is, therefore, said by the Egyptians, that Agreus, and by the Hindus, that Bharatta, came after much time; that is, succeeded to the sovereignty of the world after a lapse of years, or two intervening reigns. These two reigns according to the Chaldeans occupied three hundred years of 360 days each. The Hindus suppose them to have occupied two hundred and seventy years. And to account for the lapse of time, Rhadacant adds this number of

years to the reign of the great ancestor of Yud-hishthir, or last legitimate prince (for there are very few of the Hindus that can explain their historic records): And that the number of years might keep pace with the generations, which from six were augmented to an hundred and fourteen, they increased the 270 to 27000 years. But this ought not to have been an objection with Sir W. Jones. For however "monstrous" the rejection of two cyphers may appear in this instance; he, in the same tract, only twenty pages preceding, adopts a division of ten thousand million, to give a semblance of truth to the conjecture of an European: thereby striking off ten cyphers, and assuring us that cyphers were added or rejected at pleasure.

That the race of Cain returned prior to the death of Adam, we learn from Rabbi Gedalier, Elmachinus, and Eutychius; who severally state that "immediately after the death of Adam, Seth and his descendants retired from the place where they had formerly lived; far from the family of cursed Cain; that they retired to the holy mountain, where they buried Adam: that Cain and all his posterity lived beneath, in the valley where Abel had been killed, and took possession of those countries which were forsaken by Seth." This proves not only, that the race of Cain returned,

but, that Seth retired, and the descendants of the elder brother reigned in succession. And so say the Hindus, who date their return towards the middle of the first Calpa, recording that on the race of Atri succeeding to sovereign rule, Mahadeva, the chief of the Solar race, retired to the Mandara hills. They state all those princes, who succeeded Swayambhuva as *sovereigns* of the *world*, with the exception of one, to have been of the Lunar race, or race of Atri, who was Cain. The Mahabharat informs us "that the first dynasty of India, or that of the Sun ruled uninterruptedly for the space of four hundred years," or during the absence of Atri, or Cain, which is the same. The Purana places the period at A. M. 419; or at the close of the sixth Menwantara. It has been already explained, that collectively, the Avatars denote the nine patriarchs of the Solar race; but that individually, an Avatar applied to the mercies afforded mankind by the redeeming power. The three first Avatars, as detailed in history, describe the different prophecies of the Deity in an incarnate form; the fourth is the first illumination of man, by a portion of the divine spirit; and the commencement of the Antara of this Avatara, is stated as coeval with the return of the race of Atri: the fourth descent, in the line of Seth, is named by the Hebrews Mahalaleel, which de-

notes an illumination of the Deity. A reference to page 101 will prove that the birth of that patriarch corresponds with the Antara of the fourth Avatara ; and that when placed in arithmetic proportion, the periods allude exclusively to the commencement of the Antara of the persons described, without any allusion to the period when they became Avataras. The Hindus usually describe the date of the one and the other by a different mode. For example, if they meant to record the period when Rama Chandra was born, more particularly than by saying the beginning of the second age, they would most probably say in the 263520th year of that age ; which answers to A. M. 461. Because the proportion which that number bears to 61 is equal to that of 1296000 to 300. Or they might take the remaining number of years of the second age 1032480 ; and, adding it to the whole of the third age, and that portion of the fourth which is past, say 1901397 years ago. For $1032480 + 864000 + 4917 = 1901397$. But if they intended to denote the same period or A. M. 461, as the epoch of an event, or an exploit performed by an Avatara, they would say in the sixth Menwantara, and the thirty-fifth divine age of the first Calpa or day of Brahma ; because $461 \div 71 = 6\frac{5}{7}$; or six Menwantaras and thirty-five divine ages. By following these rules, a diligent

investigator may always arrive at the actual year in which any antediluvian event occurred.

There is a legend taken from the *Sancara Pradharbana*, I believe, of Egyptian origin ; which alludes equally to the return of the race of Cain and to the transactions of the fifth Avatar. It is translated at large, and not very inaccurately, by Mr. Wilford. The purport is as follows : About the middle of the *Padma Calpa*, there was such a want of rain in the country, inhabited by the race of *Atri* for many successive years, that the greatest part of the inhabitants perished, and *Brahma* himself grieved at the distress which prevailed in the universe : *Rihunjaye* then reigned in the west of *Cushadweep*, and, seeing his kingdom desolate, came to end his days at *Casi*, or the splendid city. *Brahma* offered him the sovereignty of the whole earth ; which he accepted, on condition that no *Devata* (race of the Sun) should remain in his capital. *Brahma*, although not without reluctance assented. So that even *Mahadera* with his attendants left their favourite abode at *Casi*, and retired to the *Mandara* hills, the holy mount. At this period *Rihunjaye* took the name of *Divadosa* or *Servant of heaven*. His reign began with acts of violence ; he deposed the Sun and Moon, and appointed other regents as Gods. He made a new sort of fire. Yet the inhabitants of *Casi* were happy

under his government*. The legend proceeds to say, that the Devatas became jealous, and that the several Avataras were ordered, in consequence thereof, for the purpose of destroying this race : That Divadosa was beguiled by a Brahman, listened to him with attention, and resigned the throne to Mahadeva. We must consider this entirely as a legend, not as a sacred Purana. Nevertheless we trace several leading features borrowed from the sacred Puranas. First, that Casi was the capital of Cusadweep, the seat of empire where the ruler of the world held his court ; who, in the fifth century of the world, could be no other than Adam. Secondly, that Rihunjaye then reigned in a province, or country west of Cushadweep : And the Scripture informs us, that Cain left the land inhabited by Adam and went east of Eden. And thirdly, the period assigned for their return, or first rule of this prince, was about A. M. 500. And Berossus places the commencement of the rule of Cain at A. M. 474. At a subsequent period, at the death of the first ruler, it appears, Brahma offered this prince the sovereignty of the whole world ; i. e. he succeeded his father. On which Mahadeva, Seth, retired to the Mandara hills ; and

* All the Puranas speak highly of the government of the race of Atri, with the exception of their want of religion.

about this time, or A. M. 928, according to Berossus, the race of Alaporus, or Cain, succeeded Alorus, or Adam, and continued to enjoy the sovereignty of the world until the deluge. The above legend is therefore confirmed by the Chaldean history, and bears a strong resemblance to the ancient account of Seth having retired to the holy mount, when Cain succeeded to the government of the world by the death of Adam. So far the accounts correspond with Scripture. Sanchoniatho informs us, that the first worshipping of the Sun was in consequence of great droughts, by which vegetation was destroyed. It is probable, therefore, that during the successive years of drought, in a hope to appease the orb of day, divine honours were paid to it: and the introduction of this worship the Hindus describe by saying that "the Vedas were stolen." According to the legend, this species of idolatry continued in the Lunar race until Rihunjaya became sovereign of the world; "when he deposed the Sun and Moon, and appointed new regents in their stead." We learn from Eusebius, that the devotional respect to plants was preceded by the consecration of those plants to the Sun, Moon, and Stars, which were the principal Gods. The deposing of these Gods and appointing of others in their stead, Sanchoniatho explains by telling us, that about this time men began to con-

secrete their ancestors : " During this reign a new kind of fire was created ;" the same author informs us, that the art of generating fire, by rubbing pieces of wood against each other, was discovered by the third generation in the line of Cain ; who were from thence named, light, fire, flame, &c. As the contemporary of these princes (in the line of Seth) was born A. M. 236, and lived upwards of 900 years, this discovery was very aptly placed in a reign, that commenced soon after the expiration of the third age, or A. M. 900. And since Sanchoniatho, who, with the exception of the inspired writers, is one of the oldest authors we have, mentions this discovery, as being at an early period of the antediluvian world, we may fairly infer, that the Hindus are correct in representing Rihanjaya as the inventor. Rihunjaya and Bali were, however, very different personages. The return of the former to Casi, or the splendid city, " rendered an order of things different from what prevailed in the Satya or first age, necessary in the second. For, whereas in the former, or age of virtue, all property was equally distributed among the members of each of the great tribes, or fathers of families, among whom there was no disparity of rank or cast, it became necessary during the Trita, or second age, when the virtues and vices were equal," that is, when by the return of Atri,

the children of the Moon equalled in numbers those of the Sun, "to divide mankind into subordinate classes, according to their talents and virtues." It is recorded in the *Smṛiti*, a book of undoubted authority, that at this period, "the four great Casts were ordained by the Being supremely glorious, for the purpose of preserving order and regularity in the universe." And, at this time, Rhadacant informs us, the two great lines of the Sun and Moon were formed into dynasties; that is, that chiefs or fathers of families, according to their abilities, or virtues, were placed as rulers over provinces. But, Mahabati, who also took the name of Divadosa, or Servant of heaven, at an early period of his life, and retained it until he had attained the summit of his ambition, when he became so arrogant, that in heaven he would allow no superior, and on earth no equal; who was beguiled by a Brahman, and resigned his kingdom to Vishnu, was certainly of the fourth or fifth generation: His predecessor, a blaspheming monarch, having been torn to pieces by the fourth Avatara. And the Egyptian authors all admit, that the fifth dynasty was headed by a Solar king.

To return to the dynasties as detailed by Rhadacanta, whose next list contains the sons of a prince of the third generation: I suppose them

to be the son of Enos, the son of Seth; the list consequently places that son of his, to whom the Hindus believe the prophecy of the deluge to have been made, about 300 years before he became a Menu, at the head of the fourth generation.

TABLE VII. PART II.

SWAYAMBHUYA.

Children of the Sun.

Children of the Moon.

Satyavatar* . . Cainan†.

Dushimanta.

Trisancu.

Harischandra.

Rohita.

Harita.

Champa.

Sudeva.

Vijaya.

Bharuca.

Vrica.

Bahuca.

Sagara.

Asamanjas.

Ansumat.

† Born A. M. 326.

* Ruler over a province about A. M. 427, or from that to A. M. 500.

In p. 82. the reasons for supposing Satyavatar to be the Cainan of Scripture, are so fully stated, that I proceed to the fifth generation. And here we have no certain date, from which to place the eldest son of Satyavatar; who, to the best of my belief was Bhagiratha. As such I place him at the head of the fifth generation or children of Cainan.

TABLE VII. PART III.

SWAYAMBHUYA OR ADAM.

Children of the Sun.

Bhagiratha* eldest son of Satyavatar.

Sruta

Nabha.

Sindhudwipa.

Ayutayush.

Ritaperna.

Saudasa.

Asmasa.

Mulaca.

Dasaratha . . . Mahalaleel born A. M. 396.

Ajābidi.

Vaiwasaha.

Chatwanga.

* Ruler over a province about A. M. 350.

Children of the Sun.

Dirgabhabu.

Ragu.

Aja.

17 **Dasaratha.**

In the chronology of Sanchoniatho, it appears that the fourth generation of Cain, the contemporaries of Cainan in the race of Seth, were the "sons of light, fire, flame, who begat sons of vast bulk and height; whose names were given to those mountains, on which they first seized, which from them were named mount Cassius, Libanus and Antilibanus, and Brathys." This account not only agrees with, but is confirmed, and explained by the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. "There were giants in the earth in *those days*; and also *after that*, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bore children to them: the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown*." Here we have two distinct race of Giants. "*Those times*" evidently alluding to the period of which they were treating, and "*after that*," to the subsequent period, when idolatry had become general, by the sons of Seth descending from the holy mount, and mixing with the daughters of Cain:

* Gen. vi. 4.

“when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men,” “and the earth was corrupt before God, and filled with violence*.” It is of the giants of *those* days, or of the fourth generation of the race of Cain, that we are now treating, before the apostacy of the race of Seth. It has been already shewn, that the Hindu and Chaldean records agree with the most ancient Jewish authors, respecting the return of Cain, about this period of time. And the expression “*first seized* on these mountains,” is proof presumptive that they were not the mountains of that country, which belonged to them as an heritage. It is, therefore, implied, that those giants called Libanus, &c. &c. returned to the holy land, or country inhabited by Adam, about this time. And at this juncture we find the fourth, or Lion Avatara, brought forward by the Hindus, for the express purpose of destroying the first impious monarch, who had in that country denied the supremacy of the living God. The son of Cainan was named Mahalaleel; which, in the Hebrew, signifies ‘a praiser of the Lord, an illumination of God’; to denote that this pious prince was an opposer of the idolatrous religion of his contemporaries, in the race of Cain. An illumination of God is synonymous with an Avatara. The Nara-

* Gen. vi. 11.

sing Avatar is the first recorded for the destruction of a blaspheming monarch of the race of Atri. Nara-sing denotes an illumination of Nara (or the spirit of God) in the form of a lion. From the genealogy of Sanchoniatho we learn that on the females of the fourth generation "were begotten Memrames and Hypsuranus; but they were so named by their mothers, the women of those times, who, without shame, lay with any man whom they could light upon. Then Hypsuranus inhabited Tyre, and he invented the making of huts with reeds and rushes, and the paper reeds*: "Hypsuranus fell into enmity with his brother Usous, who first invented coverings for his body made of the skins of wild beasts, which he caught in hunting. When violent tempests of rain and wind came, the boughs in Tyre, being rubbed against each other, took fire, and burnt the wood there." (This circumstance, it is said, frequently occurs in many parts of India to the present day.) "Usous having taken a tree, and broken off its branches, was the first who was so bold as to put to sea; and he consecrated two pillars to fire and wind, and he bowed down to them, and worshipped them, and poured out to them the blood of such wild

* It is remarkable that the Hindus, from time immemorial to the present day, use the paper rushes, or Cadjan leaves, used for writing on, to cover in their houses.

beasts as had been caught in hunting. But when these (Hypsuranus and Usous) were dead, those that remained, consecrated to them stumps of wood, and monuments of stone, and kept anniversary feasts to them." By which it is evidently meant, that as formerly the monuments were consecrated to the Sun, they were now consecrated to human beings. The Hindu historian says: "They deposed the Sun and Moon, and instituted other Gods." May we not carry the similitude still further, and suppose the two brothers mentioned by the Hindus by the names of Hirenakeran and Hirenakassan, to be the two brothers of Sanchoniatho, Memremus, and Hypsuranus? The two former are represented as giants, the two latter as the sons of giants. They were equidistant from the first created, not only with each other, but with Mahalaleel, and the Sing-avator. Another remarkable circumstance in the parallel presents itself. We have seen, that the several nations, of which we have treated, have not only a chasm in their genealogical tables, but mention the sixth generation in a different manner to that of any of the others. The Hebrews, "unto Enos was born Irad." The Egyptians, "after many years from the generation of Hypsuranus came Agrus." The Hindus do not mention any son of Hirenakassan, but record, that "in his house was born a son

named Prahland." This child was considered as his heir and successor. But such would have been the case even had he not been of his blood, according to the ancient usage*. But it appears that Prahland was indubitably of his family, although not his son. The brother of the Egyptian giants was Usous, who first consecrated idols, and bowed down and worshipped them. The Lion Avatar, his contemporary, was the first prince mentioned as an Avatara, for the purpose of opposing an idolatrous prince. On these grounds I venture to pronounce Mahalaleel the Sing-avatar. But I am inclined to think Bhagiratha, who appears as the first in the fifth generation, was not the fifth patriarch. Dasaratha, against whose name I have placed an asterisk, answers better to the character of Mahalaleel: and, although Bhagiratha appears to have been an elder son of that generation, yet as Mahalaleel was not born until Cainan was seventy years of age, it is more than probable, that he had many brothers elder than himself. The giant Hirenakassan is supposed by some to have been Nimrod. And the supposition is supported by Maurice, on the following grounds, which are equally applicable to Hypsuranus the brother of Usous.

1. "Nimrod was an hunter."

* Vide Gen. xv. 23.

274

Usous and his brothers poured the blood of the wild beasts, they killed in *hunting*, on their idols.

2. "Nimrod was the inventor of *Astronomy*."

This is a bold assertion : since Calisthenes, the philosopher, is admitted to have found in Babylon *regular* astronomical observations, so far back as A. M. 1776 : and Nimrod, being the younger son of Cush, could scarcely have been born at that period. That Astronomy was carried back to the time of Usous the brother of Hypsuranus, and contemporary of Mahalaleel, was proved in the preceding Letter.

3. "The Abranet of the family of Nimrod were renowned for their skill in Navigation."

Usous is the first person recorded as having ventured to sea in a boat.

4. "Nimrod was the fourth in descent from Noah."

Hypsuranus and Usous were the fourth in descent from Cain.

Supposing these four assertions to be true, and to be applicable to Nimrod and Hirenakassan, which is not proved, it must be admitted that they are equally applicable to the fourth descent from Cain. Neither of the giants are mentioned in the Lunar or legitimate pedigree, neither are they so considered by Sanchoniatho, who represents them as the spurious offspring of abandoned

mothers. Nevertheless, I am inclined to believe that the names of the Hindu giants are entirely circumstantial, and that they allude to Satan.

Having now arrived at the period stated by ~~Ramadanta~~ as the end of the second age, A. M. 700, and having placed the second Dasaratha as the last of the children born to the third generation in the race of the Sun, it follows that Rama was the head of the next, as eldest son of the fourth generation in the race of Seth, or fifth from Adam exclusive; and this Rama was indubitably Rama Chandra of the Solar dynasty. This, I admit, militates against the general opinion of those Europeans, who have treated on the subject; all of whom represent Rama as the son of the youngest Dasaratha, the last prince of the fourth generation from Seth, who ruled over a province. But these authors place Rama, fifty-six generations below Ieshwacu, instead of three, supposing him to be the father instead of the brother of Cushu, and contending that the pedigree was of generations in succession. But, if these princes did not reign in succession, and that they did so is utterly impossible, then the objection is removed. This prince Rama appears among the Menus under the title of Cha'cshusha, or 'beaming with glory.' Dasaratha is likewise rather a circumstantial epithet, than a proper name; signifying that

his war-chariots bore him to all quarters of the world. The prince of that name, against whom I have placed an asterisk, was father-in-law to Bharata, and father of Rama Chandra ; which warrants the conclusion, that the latter was Rama of the Solar dynasty. In the events recorded of this prince, we find some contradictions, owing to the divine Parasa being blended with Rama Chandra. The former was a prophet, or man of God, who does not appear to have actually entered into sanguinary warfare. His religious wars have been blended with the carnal ones of his father ; to reconcile which, they make Rama Chandra regenerate in the womb of the mother of Parasa ; who, in fact, was his daughter-in-law. Thus it is always said of this prince, that he was twice born ; not according to the spirit, but that he had two carnal mothers.

TABLE VII. PART IV.

SWAYAMBHUA OF ADAM.

Children of the Sun.

Rama* or Jared†.

Cusha.

Atithi.

† Born A. M. 461.

* Ruler over a province, about A. M. 700.

Children of the Sun.

Children of the Moon.

Nishadha.	
Nabhas.	
Pundarica.	(Bharata.)
Cshemadhanwas.	Vitatha.
Devanica.	Manyu.
Ahinagu.	Vrihatcshetra.
Paripatra.	Hasten.
Ranachhala.	Ajamidha.
Vajranhaba.	Ricsa.
Arca.	Samwarana.
Sujana.	Curu.
Vidhriti.	Jahnu.
Hiranyanabha.	Suratha.
Pushya.	Viduratha.
Driwasandhi.	Sarvabhauma.
Sudersana.	Jayatsener.
Agniverna.	Radhica.
20 Sighra.	Ayutayush.

At the head of the next generation is placed Maru ; whom, as being the son of the sixth generation from Adam, and fifth from Seth or Swara'chisha, I suppose to be Enoch. Against his name is written "*supposed to be still alive.*" This Maru is the same with Marcan Deva or the immortal man, whose history forms one of the eighteen sacred Puranas of Uyasa. In the history of the sixth Avatara, and indeed in every history of the

incarnate God as Parasa Rama, it is asserted, that he never saw death ; but that, when he vanished from the sight of men, he retired to certain delightful spots in the mountains ; where he is still believed by the multitude to be living, on the Coromandel coast. While the more enlightened Brahmans believe with the Hebrews, that, in consequence of his superior piety, he was translated to heaven.

The placing a descendant of the sixth generation as the seventh Avatara, and one of the seventh as the sixth Avatara, may at first appear a contradiction. But not so, if we examine their history. In a former page, the Avataras are placed according to their birth ; here they are recorded according to the period when they became Avataras, or servants of the Most High. By referring to the Hebrew Scriptures, we shall find that although Jared was born 162 years before his son Enoch, yet, that he lived 435 years after the translation of that son, and at least 700 years after he prophesied as an Avatara. For that he was so considered, when he foretold the deluge to the Hindus, as the Sapheri, and to the Chaldeans, as the Annadotus, is certain. But as an incarnation of the Deity he was designated an Avatara, during the whole of his sojourn on earth. For the Brahmans contend, that the Deity was absent from heaven a day and night of

the Gods, or 365½ years. So that, supposing Jared to be Rama Chandra, he lived 800 years after his son became an Avatara; during which period, although only the sixth in descent, he became the seventh Avatara. And the epoch appears to be fixed at the period, when he overcame the giant Ravan. For in this battle, the Dhan, or bow, of the divine prophet is entrusted to Rama Chandra.

Chryser, according to Sanchoniatho, was the contemporary of Jared; and his character greatly resembles that of the Hindu giant. Chryser is said to be Hephæstus, or Vulcan, as being "the first inventor of forging of iron." Ravan is the first Hindu prince recorded to have used iron weapons. As "Usous was the first that invented a boat, so was his successor Chryser, the first that used sails, and ventured on long voyages." Ravan ventured to sea, and seized on the island of Ceylon. "Chryser exercised himself in words, in charms and in divinations." Ravan had recourse to magic in all his contests with Rama: "Chryser came to a violent death, early in life;" Ravan was killed by Rama in the prime of life and zenith of power. We may, therefore, suppose that the Chryser of the Egyptians was the Ravan of the Hindus; and then, as the Hindus admit that the prince who is celebrated as the

seventh Avatara, was born antecedent to the sixth, so may we admit Enoch to have been the sixth, and his father Jared the seventh Avatara. The Hindus aware of this seeming contradiction have recourse to metempsychosis to explain it; and assert that Rama Chandra was regenerate; or that the souls of the parents of Parasa Rama (the sixth Avatara) passed into the bodies of the parents of Rama Chandra. There are some who pretend to ascertain their names, and say that the souls of Jamadegma and Renuca the parents of Parasa, passed into the bodies of Dasaratha and Caushalya the parents of Rama Chandra: thereby rendering the text unintelligible. The souls of the parents of Parasa Rama, passing into the bodies of the parents of Rama Chandra, clearly denotes that Parasa, or the sixth Avatara, was the grandson of Dasaratha, and therefore by implication, the son of Rama Chandra, the seventh Avatara. Whereas, by introducing the name of Jamadegma (who was the Acharya * of Parasa,) as his natural father, the whole sentence is rendered absurd. In like manner, from its appearing in the Hindu records, that the great Bharata of the Lunar dynasty was half-brother to Rama Chandra of the Solar dynasty, it has been asserted that " Dasaratha was not only

* Acharya denotes 'spiritual father, or instructor in religion.'

the nominal father of this mighty Avatara ; he was, also, by another wife, the immediate progenitor of the great Bharat ; the acknowledged sovereign of all Hindostan *." A moment's reflection would have convinced this author of the absurdity of his statement. First, as he had himself given the line of Bharata from Yayati and Dushmanta ; and, secondly, had Bharata been the son of Dasaratha, he must have been of the Solar dynasty. This forms a very material part of the Hindu record. It explains two great events, the intermarriages between the race of Cain, and that of Seth ; and the three brothers' sons of Mahakaleel, who carried on the first Titanian war. For Dasaratha having married the mother of Bharata, a princess of the Lunar race, his son Rama was, of course, half brother to Bharata. Chandra being the immediate epithet of the Lunar line, the son of Dasaratha by the mother of Bharata, was called Rama *Chandra*, to denote his descent, in the female line, from the Lunar race, or children of the Moon, the sovereigns of the world. From which it has been stated, that the great Buddha, the incarnate God, as being the descendant of Rama Chandra, was of the Lunar race. And Europeans, following the error of Baldeus, and mistaking the third period

of the world, for the third age, frequently write Crishnu instead of Buddha; thereby mistaking Enoch for Moses. Dasaratha is represented as father of three great lines; and we shall presently see, that those three were Jäpetus, Titan, and Cronus, of the Greek; although Dasaratha was only the father-in-law of the latter. To proceed with the Hindu pedigree.

TABLE VII. PART V.

SWAYAMBHUYA OR ADAM.

Children of the Sun.	Children of the Moon.
Maru * exempt from death, or Enoch. ‡	Acrodhana.
Prasusruta †.	Devatithi.
Sandhi.	Ricsha.
Amersana.	Dilipa.
Mahaswat.	Pratipa.
Viswabhabhu.	Santanu.
Prasenajit.	Vichitraviya.
Tacshaca.	Pandu.
Vrihadbala.	Yudhishthira.
Vrihadrana.	Paricshit.
Urucriya †.	Janamejaya. ‡

* Born A. M. 623.

† Appeared, ruled about A. M. 800.

‡ Appointed ruler over a province, A. M. 900.

Children of the Sun.

Vatsavridha.

Pratiyyoma.

Bhanu,

Bevaca.

Sahadeva.

Vira.

Vitradaswa.

Bhanumat.

Praticaswa.

Supratika.

Children of the Moon.

Satanica,

Sahasranica.

Aswamedhaja.

Asimachrisna.

Nemichacra.

Upta.

Chitraratha.

Suchiratha.

Dhritimat.

Suchena.

Allotting an equal number of rulers to this, as to the foregoing generation, the list ends with *Supratika*, placing Marudeva at the head of the eighth generation, in the Solar line. And who was so likely to be the son and successor of Maru, who is said never to have seen death, as Marudeva, which denotes Maru, the son of a God? As such he appears at the head of the eighth and last generation of the rulers over provinces*, before the two dynasties became entirely blended, by the sons of God coming down unto the daughters of men.

* The eighth generation was not only the last from which rulers over provinces were selected, but the last from which a Menu was selected, of the Solar race, before the deluge.

TABLE VII. PART VI.

SWAYAMBHUYA OF ADAM.

Children of the Sun.	Children of the Moon.
Marudeva * Methuseleh †.	Sunitha.
Sunacshatra.	Nrichacshuh.
Pushcara.	Suchinala.
Antaricscha.	Pariplava.
Sutrapas.	Sudhaya.
Amitrajit.	Medhavin.
Vrihadraja.	Nripanjaya.
Barhi.	Derva.
Critanjaya.	Timi.
Rananjaya.	Vrihadratha.
Sanjaya.	Sudara.
Slocya.	Satanica.
Suddhoda.	Durmadana.
Laugalada.	Rahinara.
Prasenajit.	Dandapani.
Chsudraca.	Nimi.
Sumitra.	Cshemaca.

These dynasties ~~which~~ became totally blended in the succeeding generation and were finally destroyed by the deluge. The former epoch was

† Born A. M. 688.

*† Appear ruler about A. M. 900.

about A. M. 1300, when the sons of God came down unto the race of Atri; and the latter, A. M. 1656; when, with the exception of the prince and his family, who were saved in the ark, all mankind perished.

The division of the generations, will, I trust, be found tolerably correct. Should they prove otherwise, the clue is furnished, by which the errors may be corrected. For the dates are all to be found in the originals. To the division of the generation in the Lunar line, I have paid little attention, further than the sixth; the remainder having no relation to the subject, and being merely a matter of curiosity. That Bharata was of the same generation with Rama is certain; they being the sons of the same mother by different husbands; of which sons Bharata was the eldest, and consequently of the sixth generation. That Icshwacu was of the third is equally ascertained; because the Deity is said to have instructed the first created relative to divine truths, who informed his son Menu thereof, who again instructed his first-born Icshwacu, who commenced his rule as governor of a province, at the beginning of the second age, or from A. M. 400 to A. M. 419. This account is consonant to reason. For before the return of the race of Atri, the first created lived as the father of his family; all was harmony and love. But when the

race of Atri returned, a new form of government became necessary; first, as the population was greatly increased thereby; and, secondly, as the mild patriarchal sway was ill adapted to the licentious race of Atri. Governors were therefore placed over each district, or, perhaps, towns; all being subservient to the general father of mankind, as lord of all, or sovereign prince: and, thirdly, as at this time Icshwacu and his contemporaries had attained to a proper age to become rulers. For regulating the age, by the scripture text, Icshwacu was born A. M. 236; and consequently, at the commencement of the second age, he had attained to the age of an hundred and sixty-four years. And since the life of man then averaged 857 years, it is not probable that they should have become governors, or rulers over provinces, at a much earlier age than 160; more particularly as the poet informs us, that

“ In early times to full an hundred years,
The fostering mother with an anxious eye
Cherished at home the unwieldy backward boy.”

These lines apply equally to the age of the princes of the Solar and Lunar dynasties, as to the antediluvian patriarchs of Moses; each averaging 857 years. The parallel may be continued. The Hindu princes cease to form separate dynasties, after the beginning of the fourth age. No princes

were appointed rulers later than the eighth generation in the line of Rama Chandra. The princes who are recorded in the Mahabharat, or great war, being of the line of Jarasundha, the apostate son of Dasaratha. In like manner, the Hebrews record, that the family of Seth retired to the holy mount, leaving the rule of the world, to Cain and his descendants. Now although no rulers ~~were~~ appointed of the race of Rama, after the first century of the Cali age, we may admit that those of the eighth generation, who were appointed at the commencement of the fourth age, continued rulers for some time. And so the Jews record. For although they inform us, that from the death of Adam, the world increased progressively in wickedness, so that all those that remained in the valley became corrupt, after the death of Enoch, yet they add that the total dereliction of piety, in the race of Seth, did not take place until 300 years after; when the sons of God came down from the holy mountain unto the daughters of men, whereby the whole world became corrupt in the sight of the LORD. Whether Rhadacant intended to deceive, or whether his account was misunderstood, it is impossible to determine. But, in one instance, his date is evidently erroneous. So far as Vrihadrana*

* Vide p. 148.

the dates are correct; that prince being the last appointed during the third age; against whose name Sir William Jones, on the authority of Rhadacant, places the year B. C. 3100, answering to A. M. 921. Vrihadrana, of the Solar dynasty, was about one generation after Jarasundha, who does not appear in this genealogical table: he was a youngerson of the ruler of the fifth generation in the Solar line, and consequently a brother of Rama. From him sprang a third race, who formed a separate dynasty. At this time, according to the Hindus, the world was divided into three parts, or kingdoms, named Ayodhya, Pratisht'hana and Magadha. These three dynasties became extinct at one and the same time; which account evidently proves that they were all three destroyed by the deluge. But, as the Chaldeans believe that the race of Ham, after the deluge, settled at Babylon, in Chaldea, which in the antediluvian world, had been the seat of empire of the race of Cronus, or Cain; so do the Hindus believe, that the race of Shem settled at Magadha, which had been the seat of empire of the race of Jarasundha or Seth. And as the Solar dynasty, which was continued after the flood in the race of Shem, did not become extinct until the usurpation of Pradyato in the year B. C. 2100, or A. M. 1902, the three former, or antediluvian dynasties, are, by mistake, brought for-

ward to that period. Whereas, after the name of Sumitra, p. 167, should have been placed the year *B. C.* 2346, allowing 1680 prophetic years, from the commencement of the Padma Calpa to the deluge; when the three antediluvian dynasties became extinct. It may be asked, why the deluge was not mentioned? The answer is obvious. The accounts were taken from the records of Pradyato; the contemporary of Tautus, or the first Athothas; that both were of the race of Ham; and that both, in their cosmogony, omitted the deluge; probably in a hope to obliterate the odium of descending from that race, in consequence of whose impiety the whole world had been destroyed. For the race of Ham was supposed in the female line to have descended from Naamah, the daughter of Lamech of the race of Cain. On Pradyato usurping the throne of Magadha, the Solar dynasty was considered as extinct. The twenty kings of Magadha, mentioned in page 153, were certainly the descendants of Shem; the eldest of whom, who settled in that province, might have been nearly an hundred years of age. On the division of the world *A. M.* 1758, to the sons of Shem were allotted all the eastern and northern parts of Asia; and although we know not the exact period, when the postdiluvian kings of Magadha took possession of that country, it is a fair inference that it was about

the time that Ham and Japheth travelled south, and stopped in Chaldea. For it is recorded that while the tower of Babel was building, the descendants of Shem were settling themselves quietly in those countries assigned to them, at the division of the world; and if the princes of Magadha were driven out by Pradyato of another race A. M. 1900, the period of their rule could not have exceeded an hundred and forty-two years; from A. M. 1768 to A. M. 1900; during this period, according to the Hebrews, in consequence of the encroachments of Cush the son of Ham, Joktan, of the house of Shem, passes with his family into Arabia Felix, and forms a kingdom, which was afterwards divided among his sons. About A. M. 1892, Ham comes to the resolution of avenging his father's curse; makes war against him, and drives him from his own country, having previously settled Mizraim in Egypt. Cush likewise leaves his country, goes south of Babylon, and settles at Chaldea; making war on the family of Shem. From all which it appears, that the epoch, when the race of Ham are represented by the Hebrews, as making war against, and driving into distant countries, the race of Shem, was that, at which a foreigner of the Cahatriya cast is believed by the Hindus to have deposed the king of Magadha, and to have driven the Solar race from the countries assigned to them.

The curse of Noah is recorded by the Hebrews to have been ultimately fulfilled on the race of Ham: and the Hindus record, that, although this race were successful for a time, they were totally extirpated at Magadha, about six hundred years after, and ultimately driven from Asia. As the Hindus have the most unequivocal belief in the deluge, and the Puranas place the epoch at 1680 prophetic years, of 360 days, from the Lotos creation, it is absurd to suppose, that a dynasty, which was formed 750 years before the deluge, existed 250 years after it, unless we believe that the prince, who was saved in the ark, descended from the family of Jarasundha; which there is abundant reason to think was not so. It is, however, worthy of remark, that Sanchoniatho, who wrote from the cosmogony of Tautus the first Athothes, who was the contemporary of Pradyato, notices the three great lines of the Hindus. For this author, who is silent relative to the general deluge, continues the race of Cain unto the fourteenth generation, ending with the son of Athothes; engrafting the family of Ham on the stock of Cain. But, which is more material to this inquiry, he traces the line of Seth in the family of Jarasundha from the creation; admitting a third race, whose descent is only traced from the sixth generation: a tacit acknowledgment, that until then, they were the same. "There

was living," says this author, "in the time of the ninth generation, one Elioun, from whom descended Epigeus or Antochthon, afterwards called Ouranus." That Ouranus was Noah, has generally been admitted; and then it follows, as Noah was lineally descended from Enoch, the incarnate God of the Hindus, that Elioun, which denotes Hypsiatus, or the Most High, was Enoch, who lived during the ninth generation. That all mention of the flood was suppressed by Sanchoniatho from a wish to exalt the race of Cain is probable. But, as he wrote from the records of Berytus, which were placed there in the time of Mizraim, whose father was saved in the ark, there must have been some additional motive, which equally prevailed with the historians, in the time of Pradyato;—that of disguising the real age of the world. For, as dates are very correctly marked by every oriental nation, from the time of Ham and Shem, who were both saved in the ark, had the flood been then recorded, the extravagant numbers handed down by the priests of lower Egypt would have been refuted without trouble.

In respect to the sarcasm thrown against the conclusion of the third age, like the chasm in the pedigree at the commencement, it serves to strengthen, rather than invalidate, Hindu history. For Yudhishtir was equidistant, from the first

created, with Chryser of Sanchoniatho, whom he names Hephæstus, or Vulcan, who was consecrated and worshipped under the name of Diomichius. Therefore that Yudhishtir, of the same race, and same generation, is considered as related to the Gods, at the period when the race of Cain were considered as such, ought rather to be taken in proof, that this prince was of that race, than represented as a legend fit only to adorn a fabulous tale. At this time, the end of the third age, we have seen the Sun and Moon, which were formerly worshipped, deposed, and mortals consecrated as Gods. Yudhishtir is said to be the son of Dherma or Justice; an epithet, rather than a name, and frequently given to the third generation in the race of Atri; probably the Budha of the Lunar dynasty, certainly Enoch, the son of Cain, from whom Yudhishtir descended. We are not therefore to consider Yudhishtir as his immediate son, but as a son of that house; in like manner as Ezra is said to be the son of Seraiah, although it appears that three generations had passed between them. So is Azariah called the son of Meraioth, in the seventh chapter of Ezra, although in the first of Chronicles chap. vi. ver. 6 to 11, it is proved that seven generations had passed between them. Buddha, the son of Máyá, is considered as the *God of Justice*, and the ox, which is sacred to him, is termed

Dherma. So that this epithet like that of **Buddha** is not confined to any individual, or any race. On the contrary, we learn from the institutes of **Menu**, that “the very birth of **Brāhmans** is a constant incarnation of **Dherma**, God of Justice : For the **Brahman** is born to promote justice and to procure ultimate happiness.”

You have now the **Solar** and **Lunar** dynasties before you, and will be enabled to judge how far I am correct, in representing them as the two great lines of **Seth** and **Cain** which descended from **Adam**. Should my researches prove instrumental in affording you either instruction, or amusement, I shall be abundantly gratified.

In a future Letter I will give you the ante-diluvian dynasties of the **Chaldeans**, as they are taken from **Berosus** ; which equally agree with the **Hindu** and **Hebrew Scripture** ; evincing the truth of all three.

I remain, with unalterable regard,

* * * * *

LETTER III.

MY DEAR SIR,

As inferences equally injurious to truth and Christianity, have been drawn from a paper which appeared some years back in the Asiatic Researches, I shall endeavour to explain some of those truths, which have been termed "monstrous absurdities," before I proceed to the antediluvian dynasties of the Chaldeans, as they are recorded by Berosus ; to which I have frequently had occasion to refer in my two former Letters.

For the genealogical table of the Solar and Lunar princes, we are exclusively indebted to Sir William Jones. And, although he appears to have mistaken their real import, he is, in general, a very faithful narrator. Since the series of these dynasties were published, as organized by him, those who have written on the subject, generally give them, prefaced with an assurance that the theory is originally their own. And the author of the paper, I have just alluded to, informs us, that the one he presents "is the only genuine chronology

recorded of Indian history." Whereas it appears subject to more objections, than any which I have elsewhere met with. Neither am I very sure, that the whole is not intended as a satire. For he presents us with an elaborate table, containing the pedigree of Noah from the year B. C. 3044, to the time of Alexander, or the year B. C. 300. Mr. Wilford not only gives the genealogical table of the patriarch, but the intermarriages, &c. for more than two thousand years. It is a pity that these discoveries had not been brought forward a few centuries further. We might then, by ascertaining the degree of affinity each sovereign of the present day, bears to the first king of the new world, have determined the question relative to territorial right, without having recourse to force of arms. This pedigree will be found in vol. V. of the Asiatic Researches. (p. 241. Bengal edit.) On a supposition that the above was seriously meant, we will examine it. To avoid the incongruities others had been guilty of, in placing too many generations in a too limited period, this author chooses the Samaritan text of Scripture, which carries the deluge 935 years further back than the Septuagint, and 349 further back than the Hebrew text. But this not exactly suiting his system; he forms a new epoch for the deluge, fixing it at the year B. C. 3044, making the time

of Shem to correspond with the year B. C. 2800, and that of Icshwacu and Budha, one year later. Thus 1791 years are allotted for the rule of the descendants of Noah, in the race of Shem, until the usurpation of Pradyato; the beginning of whose reign he places at A. M. 3402, or the year B. C. 600; which is just fifteen hundred years later than it is placed in every Hindu record. From this pedigree I have extracted a few dates, sufficient to evince the absurdity of the system, without a repetition of Hindu names.

B. C.	A. M.	Children of the Sun.	Children of the Moon.
2700	= 1302 Icshwacu Budha.
2000	= 2002, *Bharatta.
1600	= 2402 Rama.	
600	= 3402 Pradyato.	
300	= 3702 Nanda.	

After much fabulous matter, we are informed by Mr. Wilford, that, long subsequent to the original creation, after innumerable destructions and creations, Brahma found it necessary to give two sons to Adima, or Adam, from whom the earth was filled with inhabitants. He then furnishes a list of the patriarchs in the race of Cain, contrasting them with the same race, as given by Sanchoniatho; as follows :

- 1 Adima.....Protogones.
- 2 Priyavrata...Genus.
- 3 AgnidhraPhos, (light, fire, flame.):
- 4 Cimparache, &c...Cassuis, &c. (mountain)
- 5 RichubalaMemramus.
- * 6 Bhārata.....Agreus.
- 7 SumartiChrysor.
- 8 BevajitaTechnites.
- 9 AyaAgroweros.

The above table is tolerably correct. My principal reason for introducing it, is to shew, that this author, who spent so much time in endeavouring to prove that Bharatta* descended from Noah and was born A. M. 2002, or in the year B. C. 2000, produces, what he terms an authentic document, to prove him of the sixth generation from Adam, and born A. M. 461, or in the year B. C. 3541. His note on the third generation is likewise very erroneous; wherein he supposes Auttama, Tamasa, and Raivata, all of whom became Menus, to have been the sons of Agnid'hra. Had they been of the race of Cain, they would, of course, have appeared in the foregoing table. But, in the institutes of Menu, they are all three said to be of the other line, three of the six Menus in the race of

* See the foregoing Tables.

the Sun: Menus who perfectly understood the Scripture, who descended in succession from Swayambhuva, and reached to the deluge, named "*Swarochisha, Auttama, Tamosa, Raivata, Cha'-eshusha* and *Vaivaswata*." The information of this author is drawn from the Egyptian side of India, as we may learn from the two generations being restored. In a note on the sixth generation, Mr. Wilford explains that Bharata was the great chief, who gave his name to the country of Bharat, or Bharatawarsha; which proves that the chief whom he labours to convince us was born 1042 years after the deluge, actually gave his name to a country in the antediluvian world. It requires little logic to prove that the same person, who flourished 497 years before the deluge, could not have reappeared 1042 years after that epoch, as governor of the whole world. So that, it is clear, the Egyptians, as well as the Hindus, place this great chief as the sixth in descent in the race of Cain. And, if we remove the asterisk placed by Sir William Jones against the name of Bharata* two names higher, that chief would appear in his proper place; the first of the sixth generation in the Lunar race. In a former letter, I observed that Bharata was the half-brother of Rama Chan-

* Vide p. 142.

dra. Here we see him correctly placed, by Mr. Wilford, as the Irad of Scripture, and Agreus of Egypt, of the sixth generation in the line of Cain. So that, if any credit is due either to his own account, or to that of the Hindus, who profess that "Dasaratha was not only the father of Rama Chandra of the Solar race, but the nominal father of the great Bharata, who became sovereign of the world, and gave his name to that extensive country called after him," then must Mahalaleel have been depicted in the great Dasaratha, and his son Jared in Rama Chandra. And, as it is universally admitted, that the great war of Bharat was carried on by the Solar and Lunar dynasties, it follows that those dynasties were antediluvian.

Mr. Wilford having, with some accuracy, traced the line of Cain, and compared it with that of Sanchoniatho, proceeds to give the line of Seth, comparing it with that of the Hebrews. Here he has failed entirely. For, with the exception of one name, which is properly placed, the whole is erroneous. Mr. Wilford's table of Solar Menua, and Hebrew patriarchs of the race of Seth, is as follows :

- 1 Adim and Iva.....Adam and Eve.
- 2 Uttanahada.....Seth.
- 3 Dhrava.....Enos.
- 4 Vatsara.....Cainan.

- 5 PushparraMahalaleel.
- 6 ChushushaJared.
- 7 Ulmaca.....Enoch.
- 8 Anga.....Methuselah.
- 9 Vena.....Lamech.

Names may be incorrectly written, or the same persons described by different names. But events always mark the person intended. With the exception of Chu'shusha, all the princes, inserted in the foregoing list, were of the Lunar race. It appears that this author, understanding a Menwantara to be the reign of a Menu, and thinking it incongruous for such holy personages to belong to the race of Cain, transfers them to the better line; and then, that each of the fourteen Menwantaras might have its Menu, he extends his antediluvian genealogical table to the great grandchildren of Noah, in the fourth generation; thereby making fourteen generations in 958 years, in lieu of ten in 1656. And he previously informs us, that Dhruva, or Dherma which is the same, "was Budha of the Lunar dynasty, who married Ila, the daughter of Noah." From which it is evident, either that the ten *antediluvian* patriarchs, were born *after* the deluge, or that Ila*

* Ila, the daughter of Swayambhuva, is supposed to have married Budha of the third generation in the Lunar race, Enoch of the race of Cain.

was not the daughter of Noah. Enos was born A. M. 235, or 1421 years before the deluge. And Arphaxad, the third from Noah, A. M. 1659, or three years after it. And according to the epochs of this author, Enos, or Budha, was born A. M. 235, and Budha, who married Ila, A. M. 1302, or in the year B. C. 2700; which exhibits a difference of 1067 years in the age of the same person. These contradictory accounts form a part of the same essay; the one being given in page 344, the other in page 253 of the fifth volume of the Asiatic Researches, which, if this author was not satirizing the chronology, proves that he had no knowledge of the subject, on which he wrote, but merely copied from every legend that he met with. His table of Menus in the race of Seth is continued as follows.

“ 10 Pritha or Noah.”

“ 11 Vijitaswa.”

“ 12 Visilaswa, (during the life of this prince Swayambhuva or Adam dies.)”

“ 13 Visishada.”

“ 14 Dusha; during the time of this prince Dhruva was translated to heaven.”

“ For Dhruva, like Enoch in Scripture, is commended for his extraordinary piety, and the salutary precepts he gave mankind. He did not taste death, but was translated to heaven, where

he shines in the polar star ; but Enos and Enoch are confounded together." By whom are they confounded? Certainly not by the Hindus. For, although the similitude between Enoch and Enosh, as it is written in the Hebrew, might have misled an European, yet the pundits are not liable to such an error. For Hebrew names are not introduced in Sanscrit records. This author, probably having heard from his pundit, that Buddha the son of Máya, of the seventh generation in the Solar race, was considered as the genius of justice, that he was translated, and still worshipped in the polar star, and finding that Budha of the third generation in the line of Atri, who married Ila, the daughter of Menu, was usually stiled Dherma Budha, to denote his wisdom and justice, confounded Enoch the son of Cain, with Enosh* the son of Seth. Very many of the Bráhmans understand English perfectly well; and many of them are wonderfully well versed in our Scripture. It is therefore very probable, that the pundit, from whom this author got his information, told him that Budha of the third generation, who was stiled Dherma and who married Ila, the daughter of Menu, was Enoch† of our Scripture; which is

* Icshwacu of the third generation in the solar race is frequently spoken of as a Budha.

† Enoch the son of Cain.

literally true. Our author therefore assigns to him those honours, which were exclusively meant for Enoch the son of Jared. If the four names given by Mr. Wilford as of the race of Noah, are not entirely fabulous, which I believe to be the case, they must have been appointed subordinate rulers, in the very earliest period of the fourth age. For the Hindu records are very clear in respect to none having been appointed (of that race) after that period; and if so, it is possible, that Adam might have died during the time of *Vishnu* (who perhaps was *Vriadratha**) and Enoch might have been translated during that of *Ducsha*. Thus I have endeavoured to make sense of this contradictory passage; for the explanation attempted by the author is absurd, and, if possible, more heterogeneous than the account. For he adds, "supposing *Pritha* to be Noah, and *Dhrava* to be *Enoch*, the account agrees remarkably well with the computation of the Samaritan Pentateuch. *Enos* lived 433 years after the birth of Noah; and, of course, the great grandchild of the latter could be witness of the translation of *Dhrava* into heaven. *Swayambhuva*, or Adam, lived 223 years after the birth of Noah, according to the computation of the Samaritan Pentateuch; and it is said of *Pritha* that the earth having assumed the shape of a cow,

* See p. 151, the twenty-first name.

he made use of his great ancestor Swayambhuva as a calf to milk her. Perhaps the old sire took delight in superintending the fields and orchards of his beloved Pritha." The reasoning of the foregoing is as weak as the sentiment is profane. Nor can we be surprised, while such a doctrine is promulgated by Europeans, that "Anglo Indians" are styled "unbaptized Christians;" or that the religion we profess, should be held in contempt by the Hindus. For there is no Brahman so ignorant, as not to know that the portion of Narayana, the spirit that moved on the waters at the creation, and animated the body of Buddha the son of Máya, in that incarnate form, was of the seventh generation, and a type of that redeeming Spirit, which they expect, when the days shall be fulfilled, (i.e. the present age concluded) to judge mankind in the incarnate form of Calsi, the tenth and last Avatar; whereas Mr. Wilford affects to believe, that *Enos* the son of *Seth* was translated to heaven, in the year of the world 1140, and consequently lived 433 years after the birth of Noah, placing that epoch at A. M. 707. If the Samaritan text places the birth of Noah at A. M. 707, it likewise places the birth of his eldest son at A. M. 1207; that of his grandson Arphaxad at A. M. 1308; and the translation of Enoch at A. M. 887. So that unless we admit the Dacsha of this author

to have been born at least 320 years before his great grandfather Vijñāśwa, "the account agrees remarkably *ill* with the computation of the Samaritan Pentateuch," which places the translation of Enoch three hundred and twenty years before the birth of Shem. . The Samaritan text places the deluge at A. M. 1307; Mr. Wilford at the year B. C. 3044, or A. M. 958; which likewise agrees remarkably *ill* therewith. It appears, from these contradictory accounts, that the author makes even nature itself subservient to his views. For, when Budha and Bliarata were to flourish in the antediluvian world, the deluge is placed according to the Samaritan text. But, when it becomes expedient to detail the events of their life as post-diluvian, the deluge is carried back 349 years for their accommodation. The Hindu text, which has been so profanely perverted, for the purpose of bringing in a miserable play on words, is as follows. "He, the supreme ruler, who prescribed the sacrifice ordained from the beginning; from fire, from air, and from the Sun, *milked out* as it were the three primordial Vedas, named Rich, Yayush, and Saman, for the due performance thereof." Could any, but a professed atheist, render the foregoing,—"The earth having assumed the shape of a cow, Noah made use of his great ancestor Adam to milk her?" It is not by

ridiculing religion, or rejecting the Hebrew text of the Bible, that we can expect to convert the Hindus to Christianity. The introduction of the well known allegory of the elephants and the crocodiles, with the remarks thereon, warrants us in supposing the whole to be meant in ridicule. Mr. Wilford tells us, "that during the reign of the fourth Menu, occurred the famous war between the elephants and the crocodiles. Whenever the elephants went to drink or bathe, the crocodiles dragged them into the water, and devoured them; the Lord of the elephants having been attacked by the chief of the crocodiles a dreadful conflict took place, and the elephants would all have been destroyed but for the assistance of Vishnu: what could have given rise to such an extravagant tale, I cannot determine. But some obvious traits of it still remain in the sacred isles of the west. For almost every lake in *Wales* has a strange story attached to it, of battles fought there, between an ox and a beaver, both of uncommon size: at night the lowing of the ox and the rattling of the chain with which Behainbannawy (the great ox) endeavours to pull out of the water the Arane (beaver) are often heard." To strengthen this Welch wonder, Mr. Wilford adds, "elephants were called oxen in the west." Now as it is impossible this author can seriously intend to inform us that he

had often heard the lowing of Behainbannawy, or the rattling of his chains, we can only suppose that he was indulging a vein of irony at the expence of truth. But if, on the contrary, he is one of those ghost seers, who imagine watch-lights before death, and hear the screams of the dæmons, who await their prey before a storm, his appetite for the marvellous would be amply gratified by the unenlightened Indians, who frequently take allegorical descriptions literally. The legend alluded to is the great battle, in which Sesonchoris* the son of Amanemes, called by the Hindus the chief of the elephants, conquered the whole world. In consequence of which, the crocodiles resigned the sovereignty of the world to the fourth Avatara (Mahalaleel of Scripture). Accordingly the fifth dynasty of the Egyptians is said by Manethon to have been of Elephantine kings. Elephants and crocodiles were the emblematic names given to the race of Seth and Cain, and, even in the post-diluvian world, the Hindus were allegorically named elephants, and those who inhabited the country approximating to the Nile, crocodiles. And the Indians on that side of Asia, still contend that had it not been for the Avatars the mighty monarchs of the river had subdued those of the forest.

* Sesostris.

The next observation of this author is more worthy attention; and, as it may assist your researches, I will explain it. He proceeds to inform us, that "the Hindu systems of geography, chronology, and history, are all equally monstrous and absurd;" that they state the circumference of the world at 500000000 Yougans, or 245000000 British miles; that one of their kings reigned 27000 years; and that king Nanda possessed in his treasury above 1584000000 pounds sterling in gold;" it does not appear on what authority these assertions are made. They may be true, or they may be false. But, certainly, they are neither monstrous nor absurd. I do not recollect the subdivisions of a Yougan. But the true number of degrees will be found by dividing thereby. I will therefore, for the present, pass by the measurement. The 27000 years, which the great ancestor of Yudhisthir is said to have reigned, has been already explained. And whether king Nanda did, or did not, exist, is not very material. That various princes were known of that name in Hindostan is certain. The degree of credit due to the assertion that he possessed in his treasury at one time 1584000000 pounds sterling in gold, is the question to be investigated: If we understand the account literally, we should hesitate in giving credit to it. But there can be no more

reason for taking this account, literally, than there is for supposing the riches of the king of Jerusalem to be intended to be so taken. Taken literally, they agree tolerably well. For supposing that David appropriated one half of his revenues, as an offering to the temple, then the amount in gold was 1296000000; which brings us back to the Hindu numbers. We cannot be too cautious in giving credence to those authors, who, not venturing to ridicule the text of Scripture, select, from the Hindu records, those passages which approximate the nearest thereto, for the purpose of either placing them in a ridiculous point of view, or pronouncing them "monstrous absurdities." At the time Nanda reigned, (for during the whole of the Hindu government, the revenues were collected, and fines levied in Racticas) the gold Ractica was in value four pence of our money; and a Trasarenum is the 1296th * part of a Ractica, as follows:

TABLE IX.

Trasarenum	$1 \times 8 =$	8, or 1 minute poppy-seed.
	$8 \times 3 =$	24, or 1 black mustard-seed.
	$24 \times 3 =$	72, or 1 white mustard-seed.
	$72 \times 6 =$	432, or 1 middlesized barley-corn.
	$432 \times 3 =$	1296*, or 1 Ractica, or seed of a Gunja.

Here, as in the table of time given in my first Letter*, we find the same numbers with the cypher omitted ; and these numbers equally form the basis, by which their weights are regulated, and fines imposed : For example,

IN GOLD.

*Trasarenius	$1296 \times 5 =$	6480 or 1 Masha.
	$6480 \times 16 =$	103680 or 1 Suverna.
	$103680 \times 4 =$	414720 or 1 Pala.
	$414720 \times 10 =$	4147200 or 1 Dharana.

IN SILVER.

Trasarenius	$1296 \times 2 =$	2592 or 1 Mashaca.
	$2592 \times 16 =$	41472 or 1 Dharana or Purana.
	$41472 \times 10 =$	414720 or 1 Satamana.
	$414720 \times 4 =$	1658880 or 1 Nishca.

IN COPPER.

Trasarenius	$1296 \times 80 =$	103680 or 1 Pana or Carshapana.
-------------	--------------------	---------------------------------

In the eighth chapter of the Institutes of Menu, these calculations are confirmed. They are expressed in six stanzas as follows :

“ The very small mote, which may be discerned in a sun-beam passing through a lattice, is the least visible quantity, and men call it *Trasarenu*. ”

“ Eight of these *Trasarenu*s are supposed equal in weight to one minute poppy-seed ; three of these seeds are equal to one black mustard-seed ; and three of these last, to a white mustard-seed. ”

“ Six white mustard-seeds are equal to a middle sized barley-corn ; three such barley-corns to one *Ractica*, or seed of the *Gunja* ; five *Racticas* of gold are one *Musha*, and sixteen such *Mushas* one *Suverna*. ”

“ Four *Suvernas* make a *Pala* ; ten *Palas* a *Dharana* ; but two *Racticas* of silver, weighed together, are considered as one *Mashaca*. ”

“ Sixteen of these *Mashacas* are a silver *Dharana*, or *Purana* ; but a *Carsha*, or eighty *Racticas* of copper is called a *Pana* or *Carshapana*. ”

The weight of the *Ractica* is estimated at two grains.

Mr. Wilford gives us no authority for his assertions, nor any clue, whereby to trace the period at which his rich king *Nanda* lived. And indeed, his subsequent account would lead us to suppose the whole fabulous, did not the amount

of the riches of Nanda, nearly correspond with that mentioned in Scripture; as we shall presently see.

A prince of the name of Nanda is stated by Sir William Jones, on the authority of Rhadacanta, to have commenced his reign A. M. 2406, and to have reigned one hundred years. He was the contemporary of Apappus Maximus of Egypt, whose reign was extended to an equal length*. But we can scarcely suppose, that this was the prince intended; more particularly, as Mr. Wilford brings him, in his pedigree of Noah, so far forward as the year B. C. 300. But the princes of those days, when Nanda ruled at Magadha, were so designated, from the number of their servants and cattle, in which their riches consisted: they being evidently tributary princes to the great ruler of Hindostan. Both the Hindus and Egyptians have a legend relative to a sovereign, who ruled about 500 years after the family of Sunaca became extinct†. I do not recollect either his name, or the country over which he ruled. He is said to have been the richest monarch in the world. All his utensils are said to have been of gold: so that it became proverbial, and was afterwards believed, that whatever he touched, turned to that

* Vide Table XXV. † See the subsequent part of this work.

metal. He was evidently the Midas of Mythology, and possibly the king, said to have had in his treasury in gold alone 1584000000 pounds sterling; which, if reduced, would probably amount to no more than £203700 sterling; and possibly, not to more than 20370 pounds. For, if the original numbers were Trasarenius, they must be divided by 1296. For it would be difficult to ascertain the value in gold of the minutest mote that is perceptible in a sun-beam. Thus, $1584000000 \div 1296 = 1222222$; each of which, being in weight two grains, if valued at four pounds per ounce troy, would give 20370 pounds sterling. Or if Chuchrums, the amount would be 203700; which is by no means an exorbitant sum, if compared with the Scripture accounts of the same date. It is much to be regretted that Europeans seldom, if ever, give an account as they receive it from the Hindus. No Indian could have described the treasures of this prince in pounds sterling. They would have said, so many lacks, or so many crores: a lack is an hundred thousand; a crore ten hundred thousand. If, therefore, the numbers were to be taken literally, which is very probable, and written 1584 crores, in gold coin it might have been 1584000000 gold Fanams, of the value of four pence each; which would amount to 26400000 pounds sterling; or if

so many lacks, then to only 2640000. Now the largest of these sums, and I have endeavoured to place them in every possible point of view, is less by 6800000 pounds than David's first offering to the temple. For if the riches of the king of Hindostan are taken literally, there is no reason why those of the king of Jerusalem should be considered otherwise. And then, if Nanda actually possessed in his treasury 1584000000, David, according to the book of Chronicles, drew from his treasury in gold only, as an oblation to the temple, 648000000. And supposing that he gave one half of the whole amount of his revenues, he must have possessed 1296000000 pounds sterling. But a very moderate capacity may discover, that neither of these accounts were intended to be understood literally. Taking that of the Hindus at the very largest possible estimation, it amounts to 26400000. But this sum is not spoken of, as the collections of one year. On the contrary, it is recorded, "that he had that sum in his treasury at one time." The oblation to the temple was thirty years in collecting, and literally amounted to 75249000; which, divided by 30, averages 2508300 annually, besides jewels, copper, and brass: and this does not include any part of the collections for other purposes. We learn from Josephus that the shekel of the Hebrews contained

four-attic drachms, or the weight of half an ounce of silver; which is nearly half a crown, according to the present coinage, and just a Siccæ Roupee of Bengal. Probably it is the coin mentioned in the forty-fifth chapter of Genesis. "To Benjamin he gave three hundred pieces of silver." We may, according to the value of the Roupee, estimate the silver at five shillings per ounce; and, at the present average porportion of 16 to 1, the value of the gold was four pounds per ounce. At that rate the following table is calculated; and the riches of the Hebrew and Hindu monarchs estimated. To form a just estimate of which, it becomes necessary to ascertain the value of the Hindu weights, which are as follows:

TABLE X.

Ractica.	Musha.	Saverna.	Pala.	Dharana.	Grains Troy.	£.	s.	d.
1 =				2 =	0	0	4
5 =	1 =			10 =	0	1	8
80 =	16 =	1 =		160 =	1	6	8
320 =	64 =	4 =	1 =	..	640 =	5	6	8
3200 =	640 =	40 =	10 =	1 =	6400 =	53	6	8

As the origin of all weights used in England was a grain of corn, of wheat, of the largest size,

dried in the Sun, of which thirty-two were allowed to be a penny-weight, or twenty-four grains, so three middle sized barley-corns were, in Hindostan, considered as the weight of a Ractica, or two grains; making thirty-six middle sized barley-corns, equal to twenty-four grains troy. As these calculations, extracted from the Institutes of Menu, as taken from the Vedas, are certainly as ancient, if not more so, than the Pentateuch of Moses, they may be considered as the original basis of all weights.

A Ractica is the smallest gold coin known in India usually named a gold Fanam. A Chuchrum being a nominal value, by which accounts are kept, in like manner as we adopt pounds sterling. Ten Fanams form a Chuchrum, which originally was understood as twenty grains of gold; as twenty shillings still form one pound with us. There is a larger Fanam, now in use, of which, if I recollect rightly, five are equal to a penny-weight. But the Fanam metal of the present day is of so debased a quality, that it cannot be considered as a criterion. The star pagoda is a fair standard: it weighs 48 grains; which, at the rate of four pounds sterling per ounce, is eight shillings of our money, the fixed exchange of the East India Company.

Having shewn the mode practised by the Hindus, when they are desirous of swelling their numbers,

and having explained the three several ways, by which the sum of 1584000000 may be computed, we will proceed to the Hebrew account of the riches of Solomon. And, as Mr. Wilford gives us no clue by which to ascertain the mode of computation intended by his informant, we will suppose it the largest of these sums, or 26400000 pounds sterling; which falls very far short of the Hebrew account, as given in the twenty-second and twenty-ninth chapters of the first book of Chronicles, where it is recorded; that the collections for the offerings to the temple, in gold alone, amounted to an hundred and eight thousand talents. We learn from Josephus, that the talent contained 3000 shekels; it consequently weighed 125lbs. Therefore, 108000 talents of 125lbs. weight each, at four pounds sterling per ounce, were in value equal to 648000000 pounds sterling. Now had an Hindu informed our author, that one of their kings had made an offering of such a sum to their principal pagoda, and that six hundred millions of it was paid at one time, he would have had no hesitation in pronouncing it "a monstrous absurdity." But, if we consider it according to its obvious meaning, as we have done that of the Hindus, it is neither monstrous nor absurd. On the contrary, it is, I believe, perfectly correct. For, first, the talent of the Sanctuary, to which Josephus alludes, was

double of that in common use, by which the collections were made : secondly, it appears that neither the gold nor silver was pure, but in the ore ; and as such, its value cannot be estimated at more than one-seventh part of its gross weight ; which reduces the talent of pure gold from an hundred and twenty-five to nine pounds weight : for $125 \div 2 = 62\frac{1}{2}$, or sixty-three nearly ; and then $63 \div 7 = 9$. In the seventh Psalm we read “ as silver tried in a furnace of earth purified seven times.” I will not pronounce this an error although I suspect it to be such. For it is well known that, once refined, neither gold nor silver can be rendered more pure by a repetition of the process. I should therefore read purified to a seventh part of its weight ; particularly as the same word occurs in the seventy-ninth Psalm, which a learned author assures us the Chaldean paraphrase renders “ one part for seven.” And this is in some degree confirmed by 2 Kings v. 22. where we read that Naaman placed two changes of raiment, and two talents of silver, on two of his servants, who bore them before the sons of the prophet. The weight of 125lbs. of silver amounts to three thousand Rupees in value. So that, supposing Naaman placed one talent on each servant, the weight greatly exceeded that which any man could have borne on a journey. We must, therefore, suppose

them to have been two talents, weighing nine pounds each. Again, we read in 2 Sam. xii. 30. and 1 Chron. xx. 2. that the crown which David took from off the head of the king of the children of Ammon, when he was slain by Joab, in Rabbah, which he placed on his own head, weighed "one talent of gold." This, it is clear, was the king's talent of refined gold, weighing nine pounds. Yet, according to the letter, it weighed an hundred and twenty-five pounds. And had it been recorded that an Indian chief sustained so ponderous a crown in the heat of battle, we may venture to affirm that it would have been pronounced "a monstrous absurdity." As a collateral proof, that the talent was of the weight of nine pounds troy, I must observe, that a bag of Pagodas, in value 400 pounds sterling, weighs nine pounds troy, or the refined talent. And the mode of conveying money is in general by Golappons, who binding a talent of gold in a bag, fasten it round their waist, like the servants of Naaman.

Having established the talent of pure gold at nine, in lieu of an hundred and twenty-five pounds weight, the offering of David agrees with the Hindu numbers.

IN GOLD.

David's first offering.....43,200000.

—— second offering..... 1,296000.

The offering of the princes.... 2,160000.

In 1 Chron. **xxii.** 14., it is recorded, that the first gold provided by David amounted to one hundred thousand talents; and in the fourth verse of the twenty-ninth chapter, that the oblation consisted of three thousand talents; and in the seventh verse, that the offering of the princes was five thousand talents. Calculating the talent at nine pounds weight, and estimating the value at four pounds sterling per ounce,* it will be in value as follows :

Talents of 9 lbs. weight,	lbs.	
100000 =	900000,	at 4 per oz. 43200000
3000 =	27000,	at ditto 1296000
5000 =	45000,	at ditto 2160000
		<hr/>
Total. . .		46656000

The above is independent of the offering made by the people; which amounted to 10000 attic drachms, or 5000 pounds sterling. But, if it be understood literally, the oblations amounted to 648000000. Supposing then these offerings to be one-half of the collections, the whole revenue collected by David, in gold alone, amounted to 1296000000; and if we admit that the proportion was two-fifths, which perhaps is the more probable hypothesis, for from the most ancient times to nearly the present day, one-tenth of the revenues

was set aside for the sanctuary, before any donation or Nazar was made, then the Hebrew account greatly exceeds even that which appears so "monstrous an absurdity" to Mr. Wilford. For, as king Nanda had 1584000000 in his treasury, king David must have had 1620000000. Now, since the numbers recorded by the Hindus agree so entirely with those given by the Hebrews, it is surely at least possible that those numbers, still so well known to the Hindus, were once equally famous among the Hebrews. How far more consonant to reason, to equity, and every Christian principle, would it be, to endeavour to reconcile the records of our brethren in India, to those of Scripture, than to assert all, which we do not comprehend, to be "monstrous and absurd?" Let us cast the beam out of our own eye, ere we attempt to eradicate the mote that may be found in the eye of an Hindu. Those who, like Volney, openly attack religion, are less dangerous than those who obliquely point the envenomed dart, and wound it under the cloak of sanctity. Where is the difference between asserting that the Scriptures are filled with monstrous absurdities; and asserting those records of the Hindus which agree therewith, to be so? Had this author attended to the books of Chronicles or Kings, he would have known that the gold annually collected as fines

from the conquered provinces, weighed six hundred and sixty-six talents, independently of that brought by chapmen and merchants, and all the kings of Arabia and governors of the countries, who brought gold and silver to Solomon. The latter might be in ore; but the former, having been collected by the tax-gatherers, must have been refined gold, or specie, and estimated by the king's, or smallest talents, netted annually 2013984 pounds sterling. And these taxes were considered trifling in proportion to the sums brought by the kings of Arabia, Hirom, &c. chapmen and merchants. The Nazar, or present, made by the queen of Sheba to the king, amounted to an hundred and twenty talents of gold, or to 362880 pounds sterling of our money.

If we confine ourselves to the Sacred books of the Hindus, we shall never meet with passages that are not capable of being reconciled with truth and reason. But, while all the legends collected from the unenlightened are handed down as historic truths by our countrymen, we cannot be surprized at their appearing monstrous and absurd. Those, who dare rise above these illiberal prejudices, will be amply recompenced for their labour, by finding the Hindu antediluvian records agree with those of the Hebrew: although the former are far more comprehensive than the latter. That the

monarch mentioned as the richest in the world was the same with Solomon; I have no doubt, because the Cashmirians have a tradition, that they are descended from the Jews. The name of Moses is well known among them, and they place the birth of Buddha, the black shepherd, in the same year in which the Hebrew prophet was born. The reign of this rich monarch is likewise placed about 500 years after the time of Crishnu, which corresponds with the time of Solomon who married the daughter of Pharaoh king of Egypt*, about A. M. 2991 : and all Mr. Wilford's information comes from the Egyptian side of India†. During the last century, the Cashmirians shewed a monument, which was called the throne of Solomon. This will be more fully explained in the life of the fourth Buddha. Let us precisely multiply our own table of time by its subdivisions, and we shall find it agree with that of the Hindus, admitting ten Matires to equal one second.

* 1 Kings iii. 1.

† Diodorus Siculus states the annual amount received from the gold mines, at this period, at 32000000 of Minas ; and speaks of it as an offering to the Gods, stating that Ramphos, the son of Cetes, left in his treasury 400000 talents in gold and silver : thus proving that such a legend did exist among the Egyptians two thousand years ago.

TABLE XI.

60 seconds	= 1 minute.
60 minutes	= 1 hour.
12 hours	= 1 day.
24 hours	= 1 day and night.
15 days and nights	= 1 half month.
30 ditto	= 1 month.
12 months	= 1 year.
100 years	the life of man.

Multiply these numbers into each other, as in
Tables II and III, page 16 and 17.

Seconds	1 x	60 =	60 = 1 minute.
	60 x	60 =	3600 = 1 hour.
	3600 x	12 =	43200 = 1 day of twelve hours.
	43200 x	2 =	86400 = 1 day and night.
	86400 x	15 =	1296000 = 1 half month.
	1296000 x	2 =	2592000 = 1 month.
	2592000 x	12 =	31104000 = 1 year of 360 days.
	31104000 x	100 =	3110400000 = the life of man.
	3110400000 x	360 =	1119744000000 = This prolonged period is metaphorically said to be but a second to Vishnu: but no orthodox Brahman admits "time to exist with the immortal God."

	Seconds.	1	60	=	1	3660	=	1	43200	=	1	86400	=	1	1296000	=	1	2592000	=	1	31104000	=	1
	Minutes.		1	=	60	=	720	=	1440	=	21600	=	43200	=	86400	=	1296000	=	2592000	=	31104000	=	1
	Hours.			=	1	=	12	=	24	=	360	=	720	=	8640	=	1296000	=	2592000	=	31104000	=	1
	Day of twelve hours.	.		=	1	=	2	=	30	=	60	=	720	=	8640	=	1296000	=	2592000	=	31104000	=	1
	Day and night.			=	1	=	15	=	30	=	360	=	720	=	8640	=	1296000	=	2592000	=	31104000	=	1
	Light half of the Moon.			=	1	=	2	=	24	=	360	=	720	=	8640	=	1296000	=	2592000	=	31104000	=	1
	Month of 360 days.			=	1	=	2	=	30	=	60	=	720	=	8640	=	1296000	=	2592000	=	31104000	=	1
	Year of 360 days.			=	1	=	2	=	30	=	60	=	720	=	8640	=	1296000	=	2592000	=	31104000	=	1

These tables agree so entirely with the three Hindu tables, given in my first Letter, as to leave no doubt but that the prolonged periods of all eastern nations may be decyphered thereby. I shall, therefore, only make a few remarks on the essay that follows

that of Mr. Wilford, in the same volume of the *Asiatic Researches*.

Mr. Bentley presents us with an entire new system without coming nearer the truth. By introducing poetic and astronomical eras, he places the birth of Adam in the first year of the Cali age, which he admits to have been in the 906th year of the world. With the exception of that respecting Nanda, I cannot but think every statement of his erroneous : his system is professedly formed on a conviction, that the *Buddha* of Sir William Jones, stated by him to have been born in the 1002d year of the Cali age, was the *Budha* of the Lunar dynasty, said to have married Ila the daughter of Noah. To substantiate which, he strikes out an hundred and fifteen years, and places the birth of *Budha* at A. M. 1787 ; and then, to ascertain the dates, that should be placed against the names of his descendants he consults the bills of mortality of the present day : thereby reducing the average age of man, stated both by the Hebrews and Hindus at 857 years, to 33. Now should we admit Budha to have been the son-in-law of Noah, instead of the grandson of Adam, yet, when the age of man was reduced to one-half, the average age was then 427 years. Shem, the son of Noah, is stated to have lived at least six hundred years. For he is supposed to have been alive at the marriage of his grandson

Isaac of the tenth generation : Arphaxad, the son of Shem, lived 438 years ; Selem, his grandson, 433 ; and Eber, his grandson, 464 : and it was not until A. M. 2515, which is 613 years after the pundits all agree that the Solar dynasty became extinct, that the age of man was shortened to eighty years. To account for these supposititious dates (for Mr. Bentley does not even pretend to copy from Hindu accounts) he says, " from the bills of mortality it appears that the mean duration of human life does not exceed thirty-two, or thirty-three years. Admitting the mean duration to be thirty-three, we cannot admit more than seventeen at the utmost for the reign of each." Now it appears that Mizraim, the grandson of Noah, reigned sixty-two years ; Athothes, his great grandson, fifty-nine years ; and that, on an average, the twenty first kings of Egypt, reaching to A. M. 2423, reigned above thirty years each ; although several of them were more than two hundred years of age, when their reign commenced. Strange, that those who attempt to explain the Chronology of the Hindus should be so ill informed, relative to that of their own religion. This author proceeds to state, " thirdly and lastly, that there was but one Budha (sage) in the time of Noah, who is said to have married Ila the daughter of Noah." Hence he infers, " that the *Buddha* (prophet) who appeared

in the 1002d. year of the Calijug, or in the year 1907 of the creation, was the very same who married Noah's daughter, recorded as living near the beginning of the Tritajug of the poets, and as being contemporary *with the sons of Noah.*" It has been already proved, that the beginning of the Tritajug commenced with the fifth century, and that it was at that period, that this race returned to the city of their great ancestor Swayambhuva or Adam. But, waving this circumstance, and admitting Budha to be postdiluvian, unless Mr. Bentley means to deny the deluge altogether, from what stock does his Budha descend? If all created beings, save Noah and his sons, were destroyed at that period, from whom did the *contemporary* of *Noah's sons* spring, whom Ila married A. M. 1907? (according to the Hindus A. M. 400.) If Ila was the daughter of Noah, she was the sister of Japheth, who was born A. M. 1557. Now supposing her born two hundred years after her brother, and when her father was seven hundred years of age, she must, according to this author, have been two hundred years of age, when the youthful Budha led her to the altar. And, as we find in the Mosaic account, that none of the descendants of Noah were more than thirty-five years of age, when their first child was born, it appears "monstrously absurd, and contrary to nature

and reason," to suppose that a contemporary of one of these should have chosen a bride who had attained her two hundredth year ; more particularly, as two hundred years after, the birth of Isaac was considered miraculous, Sarah being 90 years of age. " Abraham and Sarah were old and well stricken in years, therefore Sarah laughed within herself, saying, After I am waxed old, shall I have pleasure, my lord being old likewise?" This was in the year of the world 2107 : but if we suppose, that this Budha was born, instead of having married in the 1002d year of the Cali age, and that his son was born when he was thirty, the average period in the race of Noah, then his wife Ila gave birth to that son, from whom the race of the Moon descended, in the two hundred and thirtieth year of her age. And this very incongruous history rests on no better foundation than the bills of mortality, more than four thousand years after. But even the parish registers might have taught this author better. They would have shewn him that the greater number of children of the present time die under two years of age. General history would have informed him, that the proportion of princes, who ascend a throne under that age, is as one to an hundred. And a very superficial knowledge of the English history would have informed him, that, in modern times (when the life of man is limited to threescore years

and ten, and when very many more die under forty years of age than above it,) the average or "mean duration" of the life of the last thirty-three kings of England, or from William the Conqueror, to the present reign inclusive," exceeds fifty years, and the period of their reigns nearly twenty-three years. Adopting, therefore, this author's system, we should have the children of the Sun and Moon shining at least six hundred years after the Christian era. In his chronological table, he professes to correct that of Sir William Jones, and places the commencement of the several reigns of those dynasties, of which Icshwacu and Budha are the head, at that period when the pundits universally admit that they became extinct: this author places the *commencement* of the dynasties, at A. M. 1907. All the pundits agree that they *ended* in the year B. C. 2100, or A. M. 1902. Mr. Bentley, allowing seventeen years for the rule of each child born in either family, and placing them all in succession, as following generations, allots the prolonged period of 1981 years for their reign: which he asserts did not become extinct until the year B. C. 120. At a loss to dispose of Pradyato, who is admitted beyond controversy to have usurped the throne when the dynasty of the Sun became extinct, he carries him back nearly two thousand years, making him the contemporary of Icshwacu,

and gives a list of his descendants for 1647 years, or until A. M. 3554. However erroneous the system which I have ventured to bring forward may be; namely, that system which supposes the dynasties antediluvian, thus much is certain, no argument yet produced by the various authors, who contend for their being the progeny of Noah, will stand the test of investigation: a certain proof of their fallacy. Two objections are stated by the last author: first, the alteration in the Menwantara; and secondly, the poets Valmic and Vyasu having flourished in different ages; he asserts as an indubitable truth that Meya the supposed author of the Surya *Sidhānta* increased the Menwantara from 306720000 to 308448000 years: whereas the author of that tract adopted the latter Menwantara without altering the former. Both continue in use to the present day, for the purposes for which they were originally intended: the former being the basis of a cypher, which must be rendered unintelligible, by the least deviation therefrom: whereas the latter answered better for astronomical purposes, and brought their year of 13 Lunar months nearer to that of 12 Solar months of 360 days. Had the alteration amounted to 1728000 years, as this author supposes, it had indeed been fatal to Chronology. But, as it merely lengthened the duration of a year of 355 days

to one of 357, and as, at the end of each year, the difference of hours, minutes, and seconds, was always added, no error in chronology could arise therefrom. And you have already seen that the Menwantara of Meya, or $308448000 \div 864000 = 357$; and that the Menwantara of the Vedas, or $306720000 \div 864000 = 355$. The Menwantara of Meya, likewise, accords better with the Maha Menwantara. For $355 \times 14 = 4970$; which rendered an addition of 30 necessary to each Calpa of Brahma. Whereas $357 \times 14 = 4998$; which corresponds with the Maha Calpa, or 14 Antaras of the Menus ($857 \times 14 = 11998$). The former giving the 5000 years, less by two, and the latter 12000, less by two: there was probably another reason for adopting the Menwantara of Meya. That of the Vedas is so clear and so perfectly explained in the *Smṛiti*, that any one possessing the most superficial knowledge of figures, who gave his attention thereto, must have discovered the cypher. Whereas, the Menwantara of Meya being at variance with the other calculations, made it very difficult, if not impossible, to understand the Hindu chronology. The second objection is the absurdity of supposing Valmic and Vyasu contemporary. Mr. Bentley tells us, that "these two poets were ancient and contemporary bards: that the modern Hindus believe Valmic to have

reigned towards the close of the Tritajug, and Vyasu towards the close of the Dwaparajug, and to have had frequent conversations together on the subject of their poems; all which the Hindus attempt to account for by supposing a miracle." If this author believed that eight hundred and sixty four thousand years actually elapsed between the birth of these two poets, he might well suppose a miracle to enable them to converse with each other: but as the Trita age only contained three hundred, and the Dwapara age two hundred years, it was very possible for two bards, who lived in times when the age of man was averaged at 857 years, and frequently exceeded nine hundred, to have conversed together, without a miracle; although the one should have been born two hundred years before the other. But the Brahmans tell us further. They inform us that "Vasiṣṭha the son of Swayambhuva was the great ancestor and preceptor of Parasa Rama," in like manner, as the Jewish authors tell us, that Seth was the great ancestor and preceptor of Enoch: that Vyasu was the son of this Rama, and that Valmic, who was the contemporary of Rama Chandra, lived in the time of Vyasu: which is another proof that Rama Chandra, who was the seventh Avatar, was antecedent to Parasa, or the sixth. That Valmic was of the second age, and Vyasu of the third, is

established as far as historic records can be admitted as proof. Nevertheless I do not mean that the works now extant in the Sanscrit language were antediluvian: but the followers of Vishnu, who profess to believe in the doctrine of the Metempsychosis, and who contend that Crishnu was an incarnation of the Deity, are obliged to admit, that "the great incarnate God, Buddha the son of Máya became regenerate in the womb of Devaci, who became pregnant by Maha Máya during the third period of time," or third thousandth year of the world. That "when the parents of Crishnu discovered, from the miracles he performed, that their supposed child was indeed the Lord Heri, Crishnu absorbed their minds in forgetfulness, until he had completed the divine mission, which as an *Avatara* he began, in the incarnate form of *Parasa Rama*." Vyasa the son of Parasa is admitted by all the pundits as the arranger of the Vedas. But the author, who put them into Sanscrit, certainly flourished in the postdiluvian world. Yet to support the hypothesis, that Parasa Rama was regenerate in the person of Crishnu, the multitude are amused by being told that his son Vyasa flourished during the time of ^{Christ} Moses, the third period, in lieu of the third age. That the books of the revelations of Enoch did exist, no orthodox Christian can deny. For although we

should doubt the accounts transmitted by Origen, Tertullian, and numerous other authors, who affirm that they had seen and read them in Arabia Felix ; or should we dispute, the accounts of Clemens Alexandrinus and Georgius Syncellus, who profess to have possessed the books in the Greek language, we must not deny the accounts given by St. Jude, who speaks of the revelation of Enoch as of a book extant and undisputed in his time. Now it would be just as consonant to reason to dispute the chronology of Moses, because the works of Enoch were extant in the time of St. Jude in the Arabic and Greek languages, as it is to dispute the chronology of the Hindus, because the works of Valmic and Vyasu are still extant in the Sanscrit, the most ancient postdiluvian language in Asia. The Hindus, who are enthusiastic admirers of the poetry of Valmic, represent him as living during the time of the Gods, or divine Menus of the antediluvian world, called by the Egyptians divinities : from which Europeans have erroneously supposed, that they consider poetry a divine art, practised for numberless ages in *heaven*, before it was revealed on *earth* : whereas the text merely implies that poetry was practised by Valmic, the contemporary of Rama Chandra, in the antediluvian world, and consequently many ages before the Sanscrit language (in which the Mahabharat of Vyasu is now

extant) was known on earth. For the Hindus, as well as the Persians, believe the language of the antediluvian world to have been of divine origin; each representing the Vedas as originally written in a divine language long since extinct. Meya, the first great astronomer, is admitted by all the pundits to have been born about two centuries before Valmic; and they all agree that Meya flourished during the seventh Menwantara which commenced A. M. 420.

Hindu dates are rendered complicated, from each of the six Calpas containing one thousand years, and each thousand years being the sum of the four human ages. Should you enquire of a pundit, when the Antaras of the several Avataras commenced, he would probably place Buddha the son of Jina in the first age, and Buddha the son of Mayá in the second; because the Antara of the former, or Noah, who was born A. M. 1056, answers to the 246240th year of the first age of the second Calpa, or the second thousandth year of the world; while the Antara of the latter, or Enoch, who was born A. M. 623, commenced in the 963360th year of the second age of the first Calpa. And the pundit might intentionally omit the Calpa. Valmic, the author of the Ramayana, was born during the second age of the first Calpa; and was the author of the Sanscrit edition of this poem, in the second

age of the third Calpa, or from A. M. 2400 to A. M. 2700. Vyasū, the author of the Mahabharat, was born in the third age of the first Calpa, which ended A. M. 900. But the author of the Sanscrit poem, which bears his name, could not have written more than fourteen centuries before the Christian era; because the history of Moses is engrafted on that of Enoch.

Mr. Bentley proceeds to explain the Menwantaras; although he very candidly confesses that he considers them inexplicable. And, as he understands them, they most certainly are so. For, supposing the Menwantara to have been increased by Meya 1728000 years, in lieu of two days, he naturally enough concludes that it must have been the *Maha*, or *great* Menwantara. He therefore tells us, that "we are now in the seventh Menwantara, which was the same when Meya wrote." Whereas the one commenced A. M. 420; the other A. M. 5067, or after 5143 years of 360 days.

He then proceeds with his information, as follows: "Swayambhuva, or Adam, who was born in the first Menwantara, lived *down* to the *end* of the fourteenth, which I have extracted from the Streebhagavat, and from which some *rational* idea may be formed respecting the duration of the Puranic Menwantara, now generally confounded with the periods of the same name belonging to

Meya's system, in which we are now no further advanced, than the seventh Menwantara; and which was the same when he wrote, long before the time of Vyasū." I have already observed, that the Antara of a Menu formed a great Menwantara; and, therefore, the terms are frequently used as synonymous with each other. Swayambhuva, or Adam, was of course created at the commencement of the first Menwantara: and, as all the Menus, save Noah, were born before his death, many of the Puranas and legends record that Swayambhuva ruled during the first Menu or Menwantara, and remained on earth *until* the fourteenth Menu, or the commencement of the Antara, or Menwantara of Noah, the fourteenth Menu. That he lived until the *end* of that Menwantara will not be found in any authentic record. European authors seem to suppose that the Antara of one Menu ended when that of the next began: whereas, the age of a patriarch averaging 857 years, it is termed his Antara; and placing them in succession, the sum of their years is eleven thousand nine hundred and ninety-eight. Whereas the utmost limits allotted by the Hebrews and Hindus, for their rule, do not exceed two thousand and seven, or from the birth of Swayambhuva to the death of Vaivaswat. The Antara of Adam commenced A. M. 1, and lasted on the average computation 857 years; that of

Seth commenced A. M. 131, and continued for a like number of years; and so on, with the whole of the fourteen Menus. Mr. Bentley is very correct, in saying "we are now in the seventh Menwantara." For $857 \times 6 = 5142$ years of 360 days; consequently, the seventh Menwantara commenced A. M. 5067, and will last for 857^{\dagger} prophetic years of 360 days, or until the end of the Padma creation. But he makes a very bold assertion, when he adds, "which was the same when Meya wrote, long before the time of Vyasu." Meya is admitted, without controversy, by every Hindu, to have flourished during the seventh puranic Menwantara, which commenced A. M. 420, and concluded A. M. 490, or 71×6 , i. e. 426 years, of 360 days, when the sixth Menwantara ended. Whether Meya was the actual name of the postdiluvian author, or whether he assumed that name from the great antediluvian astronomer is immaterial. It is well known that the most ancient Hebrew, Chaldean, and Arabian authors suppose Seth to have been the first organiser of Astronomy, and Enoch* to have brought it to the most perfect form which it assumed in the old world. And here we see Meya during the time of Vasishth† organizing

* Vide note, p. 112.

† Son of the first-created.

Astronomy, and Parasa bringing it to perfection; not to the perfection which it assumed afterwards, in Babylon, but to a regulated system; which the Chaldeans carry back to A. M. 463, or thereabouts, dating their improved system from A. M. 1776. I do not recollect the date of the Hindu improved system: but it is certain, that the Surya Siddhanta, in its present improved state, was taken from the system of Meva of the antediluvian world. For of the six Angas, or bodies of learning, Astronomy is the fifth of the Vedangas; as it is said to have been delivered by Surya and other divine personages; as such it is called the Surya Siddhanta of Meva; who, I believe, was no other than Ishwacu of the Solar dynasty. For the Hindus record of that prince, that which the Hebrews record of Enos, that he was well skilled in Natural Philosophy and Astronomy: and the Chinese ascribe the cycle of 60 years to the same prince, under the name of Whang-ti; to whom, it is nearly certain, the planet Venus was consecrated. For the regent of that planet is named Sucræ, or Usanas, a male deity, believed to have been a sage of infinite learning.

To return to Mr. Bentley; who, after very gravely assuring us "that we are now in the seventh Menwantara, which was the same when Meva wrote, long before the time of Vyasa," gives

us the names not only of the six Menus, that presided over the Menwantaras that are past, but of the one which we are now in, and of the seven that are to come; as follows:

- 1 Menwantara Swoyombhoo, i. e. Swayambhuva.
- 2 Swarocheeso, i. e. Swarochisha.
- 3 Utomo, i. e. Auttami.
- 4 Tamoso, i. e. Tamasa.
- 5 Riboto, i. e. Raivata.
- 6 Chaksorso, i. e. Chacshusha.
- 7 Vavioswata, i. e. Vaivaswata.
- 8 Saborni.
- 9 Doksosabornee.
- 10 Bromosabornee.
- 11 Dhomorsabornee.
- 12 Rudrosabornee.
- 13 Debosabornee.
- 14 Endrosabornee.

Nothing can be more contrary to nature, than to insist that we are actually now living in the seventh Menwantara, under the rule of Vaivaswata; and that the seven Menwantaras, which were to be ruled by the family of Sabornæ, or Atri, had actually passed, if they had not been contemporary princes. The names are misplaced: in other respects, I believe the Table to be very correct; with the exception of the last prince;

who, although of the race of Cain, never became a Menu. We may correct the table as follows.

TABLE XIII.

SWAYAMBHUYA.

2 Swarochisha.	2 Sabornee.
3 Auttami.	3 Doksosabornee.
4 Tamasa.	4 Bromosabornee.
5 Raivata.	5 Dhomorsabornee.
6 Chacshusha.	6 Rudrosabornee.
7 Vaivaswata.	7 Debosabornee.

The last prince in Mr. Bentley's table, named Endrosobornee, is improperly placed in a list, which consisted of Menus only; and was probably introduced, to complete the number of fourteen. He appears to have been the contemporary of Noah; who, according to Berosus, never became a sovereign. But Mr. Bentley, mistaking Vaivaswata for Noah, gives his contemporary in the line of Cain; whereas the Puranas expressly name the predecessor of the prince, who was saved in the ark, Vaivaswata: saying, that when the waters of the deluge had subsided, Satyavata was appointed a Menu by the favour of Vishnu by his *patronymic* of Vaivaswata. That Vaivaswata, or child of the Sun, was the *patronymic* of the Solar race, is

beyond doubt : and, if the foregoing list is correct, Sabornee was the patronymic of the Lunar race. But on this subject I cannot speak with any degree of certainty ; although I am inclined to think that the foregoing were titles assumed when they became sovereigns or Menus. The following extracts, from the Institutes of Menu, prove that the correction in the table is warranted.

“ From this Menu, named Swayambhuva, or sprung from the Self-existing, came six descendants, other Menus, or perfectly understanding the Scripture, each giving birth to a race of his own, all exalted in dignity, eminent in power.”

“ Swarochisha, Auttami, Tamasa, Raivata, likewise, and Cha’eshusha, beaming with glory, and Vaivaswata, child of the Sun.”

“ The seven Menus (or those first created, who are to be followed by seven more) of whom Swayambhuva is the chief, have produced and supported this world of moving and stationary beings, each in his own Antara, or the period of his reign.”

The words placed in parentheses, bearing a double meaning, have led Europeans to suppose them to be fourteen Menus in succession. The words “ those first created ” are not intended to denote primogeniture, but first, as greatest, or perfectly understanding the Scripture ; the word

"*following*" denoting that the Antara, or 857 years of each, or that number multiplied by 14, would be the duration of time, or the day and night of Brahma, twelve thousand years. But to prevent a possibility of their being mistaken for one race, it is expressly written that of both those lines, consisting of six Menus in each, Swayambhuva, the son of the Self-Existing was the chief, making a total of thirteen; the first-created and six princes in each race: the prince saved in the ark being the fourteenth and last Menu; who, although he did not become such in the old world, was the only person in the new one, whose age could have completed an Antara, of 857 years. As I have frequently had occasion to refer to this circumstance, and as the exact coincidence of the years, assigned by the Hebrews and Hindus, is the strongest proof, that either both or neither were antediluvian, it may be worth while to compare them. The age of the patriarchs, according to the Hebrew text, is given in Table V*, and is as follows: $930 + 912 + 905 + 910 + 895 + 962 + 368 + 969 + 776 + 950 = 8574$ years, which divided by 10 gives 857 years, and the fraction of four-tenths, for the average age of each patriarch; which is the precise number of years that the

* Vide page 100.

Hindus allot, as the Antara, or life of an antediluvian Menu; or 857×14 , i. e. 11998; which is within two years of the time. For they record that the fourteen Menus, of whom Swayambhuva is the chief, would support the world each in his own Antara," or that the period for which the Padma creation, was formed (the day and night of Brahma) would be completed, when that number of years were passed, one half of which is absorbed in the sleep of the Deity*: so that it is certain according to all their predictions, that the Calpa Avatara is expected at the end of 5999 years of 360 days; when a millennium, or age of virtue, will commence. Sir William Jones alluded to the Maha Menwantara, when he informed us, "that according to the Hindus, in the year of the Christian era 1788, we were in the first day, or Calpa, of the first month of the fifty-first year of Brahma's age, and in the twenty-eighth divine age of the seventh Menwantara: of which divine age, the three first human ages were passed, and four thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight of the fourth." The fifty years were imaginary, and only introduced to augment nominal time: the Maha

* Six thousand years, the day of Brahma, was occupied in forming the world, and all that therein is; during his night, or the second six thousand years, all will decay.

system is very seldom introduced in the Hindu cypher, being very inapplicable to dates. I will, nevertheless, endeavour to explain it. The Maha day of Brahma is equal to the hundred years of his life, a divine age, or 12000 years. For it is recorded that Brahma was employed six thousand years in forming the world, and all that therein is; which is called his great day for business, equal to the Antara of seven Menus, or seven times eight hundred and fifty-seven years. He then rests for an equal period of time; during which, nature gradually decays, and Brahma, awaking, forms a new Crita, or age of virtue. So that of the 100 years, which form his life, 50 had elapsed, when man, the last of all created beings, was produced. It is the portion of the second fifty years, or great night of Brahma, which had elapsed in the year of Christ 1788, that we are now to explain. We are, according to this system, in the first day of the first month, of the first year of the night of Brahma, which answers to the fifty-first year of his life, or day of twenty-four hours; of which, when Sir William Jones wrote, six Menwantaras and twenty-seven divine ages, three human ages, and four thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight years of the fourth human age (Cali age) of the seventh Menwantara had expired, being supposititious years 1958152888.

Now it remains to shew the process, by which these numbers are made to answer to the year of Christ 1788 ; or, which is the same, to the year of the world 5788. For the pundit, who gave this account, evidently reckoned on the commencement of the Christian era being A. M. 4000. But, according to their usual system, which places the birth of Christ at A. M. 4002, the Cali year 4890 answers to the Christian year 1788. The pundit, therefore, places us in the second Parouvan, or first Maha month of the first year of the night of Brahma.

The common Menwantara, which consists of seventy-one divine ages, is divided by common years. The Maha Menwantara, which contains eight hundred and fifty-seven divine ages, is to the common one, nearly as twelve to one. For $857 \div 71 = 12\frac{5}{7}$. And the common Menwantara of Brahma contains 360 days : which is just five days more than the Savan Menwantara of 71 ages, or 355 days. The Maha divine age, of course, bears an equal proportion to its Menwantara, namely, that of twelve to one. We must now reduce these to real time. The common Menwantara being five days of twenty-four hours* the great one is, of course, sixty days; making the

* Vide page 21, and following.

year of Brahma twenty-four months of thirty days each. To render this less complicated, the sixty days are termed Maha months* ; and the thirty days Maha Parouvans. Which may be applied as follows : the six Menwantaras that are passed are found by multiplying the Maha Menwantara by six. For $857 \times 6 = \dots\dots\dots 5142$

The twenty-seven divine ages by multiplying }
that number by ^{the 27}four years. For $27 \times 24 = \}$ 648

Total.....5790

which answers to the Cali year 4890, and to the Christian era 1788†. But the pundit who gave the account, placing his auditor in the 4888th year, qualifies this by saying, we were in the first month, or second Parouvan of a divine age ; which gave the true epoch, or Cali year 4890. And, were it not for these Parouvans and months, we should not be able to ascertain time within twenty-four years. The ancient year of the Hindus was always divided in this manner †. This Menwantara is likewise noticed by Mr. Wilford, as follows : “ We learn from Manetho, that the Egyptian chronology enumerates fourteen dynasties. In

* The Maha month corresponds with the $\Sigma\mu\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ or Chaldean month of Berosus.

† Vide Appendix (A).

‡ Vide Appendix (E).

the same manner, the Hindu chronology presents us with a series of fourteen dynasties, equally repugnant to *nature* and *reason*; six of those are elapsed; we are now in the seventh, which began with the flood; and seven more we are taught to expect. These fourteen dynasties are hardly ever noticed by the Hindus in their legendary tales, or historic poems. The rulers of these dynasties are called Menus, and from them their dynasty, Antara, or period, is called a Menwantara." This account in itself was neither repugnant to nature nor to reason; but it is rendered most strange and unnatural by the author asserting that the seventh Menwantara began with the flood; whereas, in his genealogical tables, he gives Noah great-great-grandchildren in the antediluvian world*, in order that the fourteen Menwantaras, or Antaras of Menus might be completed before the flood; and that Enoch, the son of Jared, whom he supposes to be Enos the son of Seth, might be translated to heaven during the fourteenth Menwantara, or Antara of Ducsha†; which, according to him, ended in the year B. C. 3044, the period at which he here supposes the seventh Menwantara to commence. He thus seems to forget that the fourteen dynasties of Manetho were antecedent, both to

* Vide p. 223.

† Vide p. 226.

the Auritæ and Mizraim, the latter forming the sixteenth dynasty; the first postdiluvian series being that of the Auritæ, the second that of Mestrians or Mizraim, and the third, that of the Egyptians: all of which will be proved in a future Letter, where it will appear, that the fourteen dynasties of Manetho commenced with Adam and ended with Noah. It may probably be objected, that, in so vast a lapse of years, the difference between the nominal year, in which the cypher is kept, and the Julian year, would occasion a lapse of time fatal to chronology. But although the cypher is kept in a year of 355 days, the life of Brahma, as it is recorded in the Institutes of Menu, is extended to the year of 365 days and six hours; and is believed to have been so reckoned from the 71st year before the Cali age, or A. M. 829, when the cycle was introduced and Astronomy organized. Since which they assign sometime more or less than our astronomers, to the several signs, so as to regulate the hours, minutes, and seconds, not only to the beginning of the year, but to the beginning of every month. They had consequently no occasion to add at the expiration of every third year a bissextile one; which would have been fatal to their cypher*. The life of Brahma when it

* Vide Appendix (B).

is intended to represent a year of 365 days and 6 hours, is found by dividing the prolonged number of 111974400000 by the Matires contained in a Savan year, or 306720000; which gives 365 days and a fraction of 21600000 Matires, or 6 hours. For, as the year is multiplied by 100, to produce this supposititious life, so must the remainder be divided by 100, to reduce it into the hours contained in a day of mortals. And this is so far material, as it tends to the explanation of another question. The Arabians and Egyptians usually describe a year of 365 days and 6 hours, by 365.25. Now 21600000 Matires are equal to 25 days. I am aware that Europeans explain this Eastern year, as 36.525 years. But, *literally*, it denotes 365 days and 6 hours, and *figuratively* 365 years and 25 days.

There are comparatively very few books of the Hindus considered as orthodox. And of those, five only are said to be antediluvian; although they admit of many written since the deluge; sacred Puranas, treating of antediluvian matters. The Hindus admit of eighteen Vedas, or parts of true knowledge. But the three great Vedas and two Sasters are the only sacred books, supposed to have been written in the old world: and these have evidently been organized since the flood. Sir William Jones carries them back so far as the

year B. C. 1580. I am inclined to think that they ought to be carried at least 500 years further back. Be that as it may, the Hindus, who do nothing without system, by the division of the sections, prove that in their present state they were compiled and organized in the fourth, or Cali age, which comprises 432000 nominal years. The first Veda is divided into five sections, the second into eighty-six, and the third into one thousand. By multiplying the first into the second, and adding two for the Sasters, and then multiplying the whole by the third, they obtain the number of the fourth, or Cali age; which is intended as a date. For example, $5 \times 86 + 2 \times 1000 = 432000$. No orthodox Brahman admits the fourth Veda to be of divine origin or antediluvian, but considers it as a compilation from the three sacred Vedas, written many years subsequent thereto. There are some who profess to believe the two first to have been written by Swayambhuva; the third by Buddha, the son of Máya; and the fourth, or Veda of Vedas, to have been compiled from the former three, by the last Buddha, or Crishnu (Moses). But the best informed Indians acquiesce with the author of the Gém, in ascribing the three first to Buddha the son of Máya; who says, "This divine doctrine I declared to Menu, who delivered it to his son Menu, who explained it to Icshwacu.

All ascribe the two great Sastres to Menu*, the son of the first-created, the father of Icshwacu."

In my next we will compare these accounts with those given by the Egyptians, Chinese, and Chaldeans.

Till when, believe me to remain ever yours,

* * * * *

* Vasisht'ha.

LETTER IV.

MY DEAR SIR,

WE have now made sufficient progress in Hindu Chronology, to enable us, by examining the ancient dynasties of other Eastern nations, to prove that all were antediluvian, and that all agree with the Hebrew text of the Mosaic account of the antediluvian world.

The Hindu accounts we have directly from their own records. Those of the Chaldeans we must be content to take through several hands. The account given by Eusebius, as taken by Abydenus from Berosus, is as follows. "It is said that the first king of the country was Alorus, who gave out a report, that he was appointed by God to be the shepherd of his people. He reigned ten Sari. Now a Sarus is esteemed to be three thousand six hundred years; a Nerus is represented as six hundred, and a Sosus as sixty. After him Alaparus reigned three Sari: to him succeeded Amillarus, from the city of Pantibiblus, who

reigned thirteen Sari. In his time a *semidæmon*, called *Annedotus*, in appearance very like to *Oannes* shewed himself a second time from the sea. After him *Amenon* reigned twelve Sari; who was of the city of *Pantibiblus*: then *Megalanus* of the same place reigned eighteen Sari. Then *Daus*, the shepherd, governed, for the space of ten Sari. He was of *Pantibiblus*. In his time four double-faced personages came out of the sea to land, whose names were *Enodotus*, *Enangamus*, *Enaboulus*, and *Anementus*. After *Daus* succeeded *Anodaphus*, the son of *Acdoreschus*. There were other kings; and last of all *Sisuthrus*. So that, in the whole, the number of kings amounted to ten, and the term of their reigns to an hundred and twenty Sari." *Sisuthrus* is admitted, without controversy, to mean *Noah*. For in his time the general deluge occurred, and the account of his being preserved with his family in the ark has been very elaborately described by every author, who has written on the subject.

The *Hindus*, as descendants of *Shem*, furnish in their sacred books, the names of those of the antediluvian patriarchs, who became sovereign rulers, or *Menus*, of the race of *Seth*; while the *Chaldeans*, the descendants of *Ham*, give the names of those patriarchs who became sovereigns of the world in the race of *Cain*. The following

table is formed from the account given by Abydenus.

TABLE XIV:

Names.	Country.	Reigned.	Years of days.	Prophetic years.
Alorus....	Babylon...	10	Sari = 36000 =	100
Alaparus..	ditto	3	ditto = 10800 =	30
Amillarus .	Pantibiblus	13	ditto = 46800 =	130
Amenon ..	ditto.	12	ditto = 43200 =	120
Megulanus	ditto.....	18	ditto = 64800 =	180
Daus.....	ditto.....	10	ditto = 36000 =	100
Anodaphus	ditto.....	18	ditto = 64800 =	180
				<hr/> 740

The above statement is corroborated by Apollodorus, with the exception of his making Acdoreschus the last monarch, instead of Anodaphus the son of Acdoreschus. From which it appears that the Chaldeans, like the Hebrews and Hindus, admit of but six sovereigns before the flood, exclusive of Adam. In the Hindu Institutes, the Menus in this race, are not mentioned by name. We are only informed that their numbers, exclusive of Adam, amounted to six. But, in the Puranas and in the Lunar dynasties, we may trace them under the names they bore when governors of provinces; as follows: Atri, Budha, Yayati, Dushmanta, Bharata, and Yudhishtir. The first,

as ruler of that country to which Cain retired when he went forth from the presence of the Lord was always considered as a sovereign; and the second and third, Budha and Yayati, were certainly of the same, or the third generation, and most probably denoted the same person. This does, in no way, militate against the Mosaic account. Because the book of Genesis records the generations without any allusion to their succession as sovereigns; neither does the difference in the names invalidate the account. The Hebrew names, by which the patriarchs are described, invariably denote something allusive to the character of each. So that unless we believe Hebrew to be the original language of the world, we cannot expect that other nations should record the patriarchs by Hebrew names: the Hebrews call the first-created Adam; the Hindus Swayambhuva; the Chinese Fohi; the Chaldeans Alorus; the Egyptians Protogones; each of these names denoting, in their several languages, his affinity to the Deity, as being created not born. The following comparative table may assist our enquiry.

TABLE XV.

HINDUS.		CHALDEANS.
Sun or Seth.	Moon Cain.	Race of Cain.
Seth Swarochisha.	Cain Atri.	Cain Alaparus.
Auttami.	Budha.	Amillarus.
Tamasa.	Yayati.	Amenon.
Raivata.	Dushmanta.	Megalanus.
Chacshusha.	Bharatta.	Daus.
Vaivaswata.	Yudhishthir.	Anodaphus.

That the Hindu list of kings in the race of Cain as above stated is correct, I am by no means certain. I am inclined to think that Budha, if he was not actually Yayati (for Budha merely denotes a sage or philosopher) ought to be omitted, since the fifth generation is not mentioned in the Lunar pedigree. This is a matter of little consequence. For, as the Vedas and Institutes of Menu, which are taken therefrom, particularize, that six only in each line succeeded to sovereign rule, the first-created being the chief of both lines, the fourteen Menus are equally complete whether two were of the third generation, or one of the third, and the other of the fifth. For every nation admits that the prince who was saved in the ark, and who commenced his reign immediately after

the deluge, was a patriarch of the old world of the Solar race ; and that, as such, he formed the fourteenth or last Menu or dynasty. That the Chaldean account is correct admits not of doubt. I have, therefore, given the race of Cain in the following table from them.

TABLE XVI.

Race of Seth according to the Hindus.	Race of Cain according to the Chaldeans.
1 Adam.	1 Adam.
2 Swaroachisha.	2 Alaporus.
3 Auttami.	3 Amillarus.
4 Tamasa.	4 Amenon.
5 Raivata.	5 Megalanus.
6 Chacshusha.	6 Daus.
7 Vaivaswata.	7 Anadophus.
8 14 Satyavrata,	8 14 Noah,
14 Sisuthrus,	14 Sisuthrus,
} the prince saved in the ark.	

As Adam, Swayambhuva, and Alorus, are by their historians considered respectively as the first rulers of the antediluvian world, so is Noah, Satyavrata, and Sisuthrus, considered as the first ruler in the postdiluvian world, and eighth king in succession from the creation. But according to the Menwantara system, being the last Menu, he is recorded as the fourteenth, and this is followed by the Egyptians and Persians. Manetho indicates these fourteen reigns when he makes Mizraim the sixteenth, instead of the first king of Egypt: for, supposing that to have been the seat of government in the old world, he considers the prince who was saved in the ark, and who is invariably called the fourteenth Menu as the fourteenth king of Egypt. He makes Ham the son of Noah the fifteenth, and Mizraim the son of Ham the sixteenth. These fourteen reigns are evidently those called in the old chronicle the reign of the Gods. The author prefaces them with Hephaistos, or the living God (the creative power of the Hindus). Then comes Helius the son of Hephaistus, answering to Swayambhuva, the son of the self-created, and Fohi the son of Heaven. Helius reigned three myriads of years, or 83 prophetic years, and 120 days from the year 817; and the Egyptians suppose him to have died when 900

years were passed. After Helius, came the twelve divinities, with Cronus, making in all fourteen reigns. In the twelve Egyptian divinities we plainly trace the twelve divine Menus of the Hindus; and in Cronus, the prince who was saved in the ark, in whom time was renewed in the post-diluvian world. For the Egyptians, at different times, equally describe the Deity, the first-created, and the prince who was saved in the ark, under the title of Cronus. The reign of the twelve divinities is stated at 3984 years. But this, properly, is the sum of the Antara of the princes of one race collectively. For $3984 \div 6 = 664$ Savan years of 355 days, which are equal to 645 Egyptian years. This falls short of the average Antara of an Hebrew patriarch, or Hindu Menu, stated at 857 years. But the Hindus calculate from the creation to the deluge; making 1656 years. Whereas the Chaldeans and Egyptians reckon from the return of Cain, or when fifteen myriads of years were passed, answering to A. M. 413. Which reduces the years to 1243; and $857 : 1656 :: 645 : 1246$; leaving a fraction of 177 days in the life of each of the six princes in either race; and fractions are necessarily rejected in every cypher. Thus is the account of Manetho confirmed by the old chronicle, and each sanctioned

by the Hebrew text of Scripture. The Egyptian tables run thus*.

TABLE XVII.

Old Chronicle.	Manetho.
Helius or Adam.....	1 Antediluvian patriarch.....14
6 demigods in the race of Cain...}	7 Ham.....15
6 ditto in the race of Cain <i>Seth</i>}	13 Mizraim.....16
Cronus or Noah.....	14

The Hebrew account of the death of the patriarchs is confined to the race of Seth. Supposing those of the race of Cain to correspond therewith, we have fourteen reigns, or six kings who reigned in succession, in each race, exclusive of Adam and Noah. For although ten generations of patriarchs are recorded, six only *reigned* in succession. Enoch was translated during the life of his father Jared; and Lamech died five years before his father Methuselah. Consequently neither Enoch or Lamech became kings. And as the deluge was withheld until the death of Methuselah, his grandson Noah was equally excluded from reigning in the antediluvian world. He is therefore recorded

* Vide Letter VI.

separately, as the eighth prince in succession, the fourteenth Menu, and first king of the postdiluvian world. The Egyptians name him the *Semedio*; to denote that although his Antara was among the divinities, his reign was among mortals. A reference to the fifth Table will elucidate the following, and prove that there were only six princes who reigned, and that the aggregate time of their rule was 725 years.

TABLE XVIII.

ADAM.

1 Seth reigned years...	112
2 Enos.....	98
3 Cainan.....	95
4 Mahalaleel.....	55
5 Jared.....	132
Enoch.	
6 Methuselah.....	233
	<hr/>
	725
Lamech.	
Noah.	

Admitting the same number of sovereigns in the race of Cain, the fourteen dynasties are complete according to the Hebrew Scriptures. Adam, one; the six princes in the line of Seth, seven;

the six in the line of Cain, thirteen ; and Noah fourteen. From the foregoing table it appears, that the aggregate years of the reigns of the six princes from the death of Adam to the deluge was 725 years. In the fifteenth table, as taken from the account of Berosus, they are stated at 740. But those were prophetic years. For the account is given in *Σαροι*, or periods of 3600 days. The Chaldeans, equally with the Hindus and Chinese, place the deluge at 1680 prophetic years from the creation, or 168 *Σαροι*. For the 120 *Σαροι*, mentioned by Abydenus, allude to the rule of Cain, or the Chaldeans ; and 1680 prophetic years answer to 1656 Julian years. Now 740 prophetic years of 360 days answer to 728 Julian ones ; and 940 prophetic years to 928 Julian ones. Thus $928 + 728 = 1656$, and $740 + 940 = 1680$. This places the death of Alorus at A. M. 928, in lieu of 931 ; and allots 728 years, in lieu of 725, for the reign of the six princes. But we must recollect that Berosus recorded in *Σαροι*, or periods of 3600 days ; and as it is morally impossible that the several princes should have died precisely at the end of one of those periods, we must suppose the time to have been marked by the *Σαροι* to which it came most near, and the princes to have reigned collectively for 73 *Σαροι* and 7 years. It is in round numbers stated at 74 *Σαροι*. Consequently,

the three years, which were taken from the life of Adam, were added to the reign of the princes. There is no doubt, but that the original account was more correct. For Berosus would scarcely have taken the trouble to inform us, that a *Σωρος* was one month of 60 days, and a *Νειρος* ten months of the same length, if he had not intended them to convey information. The *Νειρος* and *Σωρος* of the Chaldeans served to divide the *Σαρος*, in like manner as the divine age and Parouvan divided the Menwantara. Most probably Berosus wrote 73 *Σαροι*, 4 *Νειροι*, and 2 *Σωροι*; and his translator, not understanding the measurement of time, gave all in round numbers, so as to complete the period. Be that as it may, it is proved beyond controversy, that the deluge is placed in the same year, that we find it in the Hebrew pentateuch. And then, whether Adam lived 928, or 931 years, is not very material.

The reign of Adam has not been included in either table: because the Hebrews who reckon from the creation, consider the whole period of his life regal. Almost every other nation, reckoning from the cycle of 60, places the commencement of his reign at A. M. 817. The motive was probably, a desire to reconcile the various dates that appeared, in consequence of the different lengths of the year, used by different nations. The Chinese

allot 115 years for his reign; the Chaldeans ten *Σαροι*, or an hundred years; the Egyptians three myriads of years, equal to 83 years and 120 days. The two latter nations, although they differ in the terms used, agree in their calculations. The usual *Σαρος* of the Chaldeans appears to have been 360. But here the time is marked by Eusebius, who tells us the *Νεϊρος* was of six hundred, instead of sixty; thereby making ten *Σαροι*, or 36000 days, equal to an hundred years, as 3600 is to 10. For an hundred years of 360 days, or $360 \times 100 = 36000$. The same mode reduces the three myriads of years, or days, to 83 years and a fraction of 120 days. For $30000 \div 360 = 83\frac{1}{3}$. The different modes in which those different nations recorded time, obliged them to make an alteration in the number of years assigned for the reign of the first-created; each nation reckoning the commencement of his reign from A. M. 817, and the commencement of the reign of the first postdiluvian prince from the expiration of 1680 prophetic years, answering to A. M. 1657. The Chinese allot 115 years to the reign of Fohi; for $932 - 115 = 817$. This differs in only one year from the date of the death of Adam A. M. 931: and although they do not specify the number of years which the six succeeding princes reigned, yet as they place the commencement of the reign of Yau one year after the deluge, fixing

that epoch at 1680 prophetic years from the creation, or A. M. 1656, the intervening space was by implication 724 years. And this agrees well with the Hebrew text which states it at 725 years*. The Chaldeans, tracing the reign of the six princes back from A. M. 1656 by prophetic years, place the death of the first-created at A. M. 917†. They therefore assign one hundred years for the reign of Alorus : or $917 - 100 = 817$. While the Egyptians, using symbolic expressions, say, "the third age being completely ended, Buddha," or the first-created, "ended his mortal career." They therefore assign three myriads of years to the reign of Helius : for $900 - 83 = 817$. But the Hindus, like the Hebrews, do not assign any given number of years to the reign of the first-created ; considering his whole Antara as such. And it has already been explained, that although the Hindu cypher is kept in even numbers, yet that they consider the year as consisting of 365 days and a quarter, or the life of Brahma divided by a Menwantara, adding at the end of each month, the minutes necessary for its completion. The Fakiers assign to every year 365 days, 15 hours, 31 minutes, 15 seconds ; which answers to 365 days, 6 hours, 12

* Vide Table XVI.

† Vide Table XIX.

minutes, 30 seconds, of our time. Now the Egyptian year was altered by the first Athothes, in or about A. M. 1958, at the latest; and from that period it is admitted, that the length of the several years in which their history is recorded, agrees with the Hindu year of 365 days, 15 hours, 31 minutes, 15 seconds. This alteration was at least six hundred years before the pentateuch of Moses could possibly have been written. Nevertheless, all Scripture prophecies are recorded in years of 360 days. The period for the reign of the six antediluvian princes, as given by Berosus, agreeing with those recorded in the Hebrew text of Scripture, the one corroborates the other.

TABLE XIX.

Alorus *	died after years	917
Alaparus began his reign after 917 prophetic years were passed, reigned 30 died after years	947	1077
Amillarus	130
Amenon	120
Megalanus	180
Daus	100
Anadophus	180
Sisuthros	1657

The next Table is given from the Hebrew text of our Scripture, according to the year of the world.

* The error in this date is easily accounted for. The flood is placed according to the true epoch, or 1656 years of 365 days, 6 hours, and a fraction: and the reigns of the princes calculated in *Σαροι* at periods of 3600 days. Berosus, more correct, and counting in round numbers, places the death of Alorus after 94 *Σαροι* or A. M. 928: because it occurred in the second *Νειπος*, or third year of the ninety-fifth *Σαροι*, answering to A. M. 931: which being the first *Νειπος* of the eleventh *Σαροι*, from the commencement of the cycle of 60 years, the reign of Alorus is stated at 10 *Σαροι*, or one hundred years of 360 days. Vide Tables XIV and XXII.

TABLE XX.

Adam.....	died A. M.	931
Seth began his reign A. M.	931 reigned years	112
Enos.....	1043	98
Cainan.....	1141	95
Mahalaleel.....	1236	56
Jared.....	1291	132
Methuselah.....	1423	233
Noah.....	1657.	

To form a correct comparative table of the two races, we must reduce the number of years the former are said to have reigned, to Julian years, or more properly speaking to Hindu years. For the year that we term Julian, was introduced soon

after the flood, if not long antecedent to it. We find it in the most ancient works of the Hindus, the Vedas. And it was certainly introduced by Athothes into Egypt, during his reign, which commenced more than six hundred years before the pentateuch of Moses was written, and at least one thousand six hundred before this year was introduced by Cæsar. In the following table, to avoid fractions, I shall carry the excess of days to the succeeding reign ; that is, as the reign of Alaparus was 30 prophetic years, equal to 29 years and 208 days, I state his reign at 29 years, carrying the excess of days to the reign of Amillarus ; and so on, in the following comparative statement.

TABLE XXI.

Descendants of Adam in the race of Seth.	Descendants of Alorus in the race of Cain.	Prophetic years.	Years.
Seth reigned years 112	Alaparus reigned 30	=	29
Enos 98	Amillarus 130	=	128
Cainan 95	Amenon 120	=	119
Mahalaleel 55	Megalanus 180	=	177
Jared 132	Daus 100	=	98
Enoch.			
Methuseleh 233	Acdoreschus.		
Lamech.	*Anadophus 180	=	177
Noah.	Amempsinus.		

If from 728 years we deduct the three years just mentioned, the Chaldean and Hebrew account agree, to a year, in respect to the time that the six princes reigned. But, placing them as they now stand, the dates would be as follows :

TABLE XXII.

	Years of the World.	Prophetic years.	A. M.
Alorus began his reign	1 =	1	died 928 = 940
Alaparus.....	928 =	940 reigned 29 =	30 ... 957 = 970
Amillarus.....	957 =	970	128 = 130 ... 1085 = 1100
Amenon.....	1085 =	1100	119 = 120 ... 1204 = 1220
Megalanus.....	1204 =	1220	177 = 180 ... 1381 = 1400
Daus.....	1381 =	1400	98 = 100 ... 1479 = 1500
Anadophus.....	1479 =	1500	177 = 180 ... 1656 = 1680
			<hr/> 728 = 740

The foregoing tables demonstrate, that the kings enumerated in the list of Berossus were no other than the six patriarchs of the old world; who

succeeded each other in the government of the world, after the death of the first-created. Both Abydenus and Apollodorus agree in the above statement; placing the number of *Σαροι* that each reigned against their respective names, and adding "there were other princes (or patriarchs) so that the sum of the number of princes who *reached to the deluge* was ten;" agreeably to the lists given in the comparative statement, making the prince who was saved in the ark the eighth ruler, and last patriarch. That he was so considered by the Hebrews, is recorded in the Old Testament, and confirmed in the new. For the dates given in the foregoing tables are extracted from the fifth chapter of Genesis: and, in the second Epistle of St. Peter, chap. vi, we read that "God spared not the old world, but saved Noah the *eighth* person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing the flood upon the world of the ungodly." We further learn from the works of Berossus, that the race, which he records, was that of Cain; for although the number of years from the death of Adam to the deluge, the number of princes that succeeded each other during that space, and the aggregate number of years which their reigns occupied, all agree with the Hebrew text, yet the specific length of each reign differs from those in the line of Seth; a strong corrobora-

ative proof of their authenticity. It has been urged that Abydenus and Apollodorus differ in their accounts of these reigns. This is in part true; the former being the more correct historian. He informs us that "after Daus succeeded Anadophus the son of Adoreschus:" In like manner as the Hebrew text records, that after Jared succeeded Methuselah the son of Enoch: while Apollodorus, observing in the list of patriarchs, that the name of Adoreschus followed that of Daus*, in like manner, as the name of Enoch followed that of Jared in the Hebrew, without adverting to the period of his death, supposes him the successor of his father. Elmachinus is guilty of the same error. For he tells us that "when the death of Jared approached, he assembled his sons *Enoch*, *Methuselah*, *Lamech*, and *Noah*; and exhorted them relative to the wickedness, and impiety of the times." And another author (*Eutychius*) informs us that "he appointed his eldest son *Enoch* to succeed him." Now we know that Enoch was translated 435 years before the death of Jared. But it is certain that many authors, ancient as well as modern, represent the ten patriarchs as ten kings; whereas six only, exclusive of Adam, became sovereigns. This distinction is marked by Berosus, and followed by

* Vide Table XXI.

Abydenus, although neglected by others. Again, Abydenus names the prince who was saved in the ark; Sisuthros; Apollodorus names him Amempsinus*. But as each, after the name adds, "during his time happened the well-known deluge," the generation intended is identified beyond controversy. Both Apollodorus and Alexander Polyhistor are said to allot 18 *Σαοι* for the reign of the prince, who was saved in the ark; but neither of them pretends that it was in the antediluvian world, or mentions the deluge, as having been during his reign. One author says, "this last was the *person* who was warned to provide against the deluge:" another "in whose *time* was the well-known deluge:" a third "in whose *time* was the great deluge." The Apostle states him to have been the eighth *person*, not the eighth *king*. Every nation places the first year of the reign of the patriarch, who was saved in the ark, the year after the commencement of the deluge. In respect

* Amempsinus was probably the contemporary of Noah; but, not having succeeded to regal sway, he was very properly omitted by Berosus among his list of kings. Nevertheless, as being of the tenth generation of patriarchs in the line of Alaparus, it might be said: "in his *time* was the well-known deluge." A similar circumstance occurs in the Hindu history. It is recorded "that during the time of Malecheron happened the great deluge." But this prince, although of the tenth generation in the line of Atri, so far from being the sovereign of the world, ruled at Mavaliporam, on the coast of Coromandel.

to the eighteen *Σαροι*, which he is said to have reigned, there appears some error. Abydenus, the most faithful copyist from Berosus, does not mention it; and Apollodorus so evidently mistakes the patriarchs for the kings, that it is probable, as the last king of the race of Alaparus (Cain) reigned 18 *Σαροι*, that he placed that number against the name of the prince whom he supposed to have been saved in the ark. The account given by Syncellus is evidently supposititious; being founded on what he supposed the meaning of Berosus. Reading that the sum of the princes, or the generations of the patriarchs was ten, and the duration of their rule an hundred and twenty *Σαροι*, by way of elucidating a text, which he appears not to have understood, he carries Amempsinus, the name given by Apollodorus to the prince of the tenth generation, back to the eighth: and that the number of the kings might be ten, and the duration of their collective reigns, an hundred and twenty *Σαροι*, he adds to the seventy-four *Σαροι*, assigned by the priests of Bels for the reign of the kings of the race of Alaparus, ten *Σαροι*, for the reign of Amempsinus, and introduces another king whom he names Otiartes of Larancha; and allots eight *Σαροι* for his reign. Adding: "then came his son Xisusthrus, who reigned eighteen *Σαροι*, in whose time was the well-known deluge." He thereby brings

the epoch of the deluge forward no less than thirty-six *Σαροι*, equal to 355 Julian years, in direct opposition to his text; which states the first forty-six *Σαροι* of the rule of the race of Alaparus (Cain) to have been subordinate to Alorus. This admits of no doubt. For the priest states the year in which Alaparus commenced his reign, as seventy-four *Σαροι* before the deluge; which answers to the year B. C. 3076, or to A. M. 928. Berosus was not writing the history of the world from the creation, but the history of the race of Alaparus for an hundred and twenty *Σαροι*, or twelve hundred years, "reaching to the deluge." This account commences from their first rule, not reign at Sipora (Chaldea), to which place he supposes them to have returned after fifteen myriads of years from the creation; which answers to forty-one *Σαροι*, three *Νεσροι*, and six *Σωσροι*; or about four hundred and twelve years and seven months, and which places the return of this race in the year of the world 413. The Hindus place this epoch at A. M. 419. For the six Menwantaras ended with 426 prophetic years; which is somewhat short of 420 years. It is more than probable that the epochs were actually the same. For the words "*close of the Menwantara*," denote that it was not actually concluded. Six years might, therefore, have been unexpired. Berosus then proceeds to tell us, that

this race, which returned A. M. 413, did not acquire any rule in the country until the end of the forty-eighth *Σαρος*, answering to A. M. 474 : that, from that time, they were rulers over provinces : that, at the death of Alorus, A. M. 928, he was succeeded in the sovereignty of the world by his eldest son : and that this race reigned in succession for 74 *Σαροι*, when the world was destroyed by a deluge. You will, perhaps, say, not one word of this do I recollect in Eusebius. Most true : but we learn from Eusebius, that the deluge happened after seven days, or 168 *Σαροι* ; and that of those 168 *Σαροι*, the race, whose history Berosus recorded, ruled only 120 *Σαροι*, or 1182 years : consequently as 168 *Σαροι* are equal to 1656 years and a fraction, and as the rule of this race lasted 1182 years and ended A. M. 1656, it must have commenced A. M. 474. And, in respect to the number of years each prince reigned as a sovereign, they are particularized by Eusebius and the several authors from whom the twenty-second table is formed. As if to prevent a possibility of misconception, Berosus informs us of the countries to which each prince belonged. This author was a native of Babylon, and a priest of Belus. Of course, then, he had every opportunity of procuring information. He does not mention the expulsion of Cain, for obvious reasons ; being unwilling to disgrace that

race from which he sprang, the race of Ham, who in the female line is supposed to have descended from Cain. But by particularizing their return he denotes their absence. He then tells us, that the two first kings, Alorus and Alaparus were by nation Chaldeans. Adam and Cain were both of that country, where the Lord placed Adam after the fall; which Berosus supposes to be Chalda, formerly called Sepora. The next, or third king, is mentioned doubtfully. "Then came Amillarus from the city of Pantibiblus:" which is equally applicable, whether he was born at Pantibiblus, or whether he retired thither when an infant, with his father Alaparus. The same doubt exists in the Mosaic account. "Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod, east of Eden." Here he builds a city, and calls "the name of the city after the name of his son, Enoch;" which proves that Enoch was considered as being of the city of Enoch, in the land of Nod, even although he should have been born at Sepora, or Babylon. Accordingly Berosus says, "then came Amillarus from the city of Pantibiblus; not of the city of Pantibiblus, which answers to each of the four succeeding kings. It is recorded that they were of Pantibiblus, not that they were, or were not, born there, but that they were of that nation. Which was certainly the case with all the

kings of that line (the race of Cain). There is not, I believe, any account where Pantibiblus was situated. It is a natural inference that it was the city of Enoch, the capital of Nod, on the site of which, some suppose the city of Shushan to have been built, which after the deluge became the capital of Persia. It is of little consequence, whether Babylon was the name of the city, or Chaldea that of the country, which our first parent inhabited. Whether the city was called Cagi, Sepora, or Babylon in the antediluvian world, cannot invalidate an history which is confirmed by every other nation, both in respect to incident and date. Whatever may be the fact, it was natural enough that the descendants of Ham should arrogate to their country, the honour of its having been the residence of the sovereigns of the universe, from the commencement of time ; more particularly if that race sprung in the female line from those sovereigns. And, since the monarchy of Assyria owed its origin to their great progenitor Ham, Bochart supposes the ark to have been built in the land of Shinar, near the river Tigris, on the northern side of Babylon ; which favours the opinion of Berosus. Much stress has been laid on this circumstance ; far more than it merits. The coincidence of dates is sufficient to do away any doubts which the name of the city might create. The Hindus

represent the Vedas as stolen, or idolatry introduced, about A. M. 419, and assign a period of 726 years from the death of Adam to the deluge: During which time they admit that the race of Atri or Cain were sovereigns of the world. The Mahabharat says; "for 700 years the children of the Moon had an undisputed rule, in like manner as the children of the Sun had during the age of virtue, or the first 400 years." Berosus assigns 412 years to the race of Seth, before the return of Cain, and 728 years for the rule of that race, which ended with the flood. The Hebrews give us both the expulsion and return of Cain: the former is particularized in the fifth chapter of Genesis; the latter (the return) is no further noticed in Scripture than by the birth of Irad. Now Irad was the contemporary of Jared, who was born A. M. 461. But as Cain is said to have been born an hundred years before Seth, so might Irad be born fifty years before Jared. Neither does it follow that he was born immediately after the return of that race. The Hebrew authors all agree that idolatry was introduced in consequence of their return early in the fifth century; and speak of Mahalaleel's carrying on grievous wars against the idolatrous race of Cain. And the Chaldeans, who date their return at A. M. 413, admit that it was sixty years from that period, before they

became rulers over provinces. Three several authors record that this race, after they assumed power and were acting as rulers, were under the supreme control of Adam, by whom they were kept in subjection. One author says "that when the death of Adam was near, he commanded his son Seth, to attend him with his brethren and children and their respective wives ; to whom he gave charge that they should dwell in the holy mountain ; that they should not return therefrom and mix with the race of Cain ; and appointed Seth his successor." Others inform us, that "immediately on the death of Adam, Seth being wearied with the wickedness of the family of Cain, his neighbours, and fearing, *now* Adam was dead, that they should commit *yet more public* and open acts of hostilities, retired from the place where they had resided during the life of Adam, far from the family of cursed Cain." Again, "Seth took his eldest son Enos, and Cainan the son of Enos, and Mahalaleel the son of Cainan, and their wives, and brought them up unto that high mountain on which Adam was buried ; and Cain and all his posterity lived beneath in the valley, where Abel was killed ; and so they took possession of those countries which were forsaken by Seth." This account is given by Rabbi Gidalier, Elmachinus, and Eutychius ; who adds, "upon this, Seth was made the ruler and governor of all

those who went with him :'' Evidently admitting, that Cain became sovereign of the world, on the death of Adam, and took possession of those countries, which had been previously under the supreme rule of the first patriarch, where the regal authority had been held. So it is said by the Hindus, that the return of the race of Atri, was towards the middle of the first Calpa, and that, when the first prince of that race succeeded to regal power, he obliged Mahadeva the son of the first-created to retire from the city of Casi, or the splendid, and to reside on the Mandara hill, or holy mount. With this body of evidence before us, we must either reject the Hebrew, or admit the Hindu and Chaldean account of the antediluvian world. For this coincidence of dates may be considered as mathematical demonstration. The three periods may be divided as follows: The undisturbed rule of the Sun before the return of Atri; from thence to the death of the first-created; and the rule of the race of Atri, from that period to the deluge.

TABLE XXIII.

FIRST PERIOD.		SECOND PERIOD.		THIRD PERIOD.
Undisturbed rule of the race of Seth.		From the return of Cain to the death of Adam.		Undisputed rule of Cain from the death of Adam to the deluge.
Hebrew 420	+	511	+	725 = 1656
Hindu 419	+	511	+	726 = 1656
Chaldean 413	+	515	+	728 = 1656

Taking those numbers in the prophetic years of the Hindus and *Σαροι* of the Chaldeans, they would stand as follows :

$$\begin{array}{lcl}
 \text{Hebrew} & 420 + 511 + 725 = 1656 \\
 \text{Hindu} & 426 + 516 + 738 = 1680 \\
 \text{Chaldean} & 416 + 524 + 740 = 1680 = 168 \text{ } \Sigma\alpha\rho\iota.
 \end{array}
 \left. \begin{array}{l} \\ \\ \end{array} \right\} \begin{array}{l} \text{Prophetic} \\ \text{years.} \end{array}$$

The foregoing table strengthens the hypothesis; relative to the seven prophetic days, or 1680 prophetic years, from the creation, being the epoch predicted for the general deluge. Nothing can be more at variance with truth, than the arguments brought forward by those, who profess to prove, that oriental nations have no certain knowledge relative to the epoch when the deluge commenced. If these nations profess ignorance or mystery on the subject, it is with a view to deceive; not that they are deceived. They do not chuse to acknowledge, that this great calamity happened at so

recent a period. First, compared with their protracted numbers, 3000 years is as nothing; and, next, as they trace their genealogy back to that year, the stating the deluge in plain figures would be acknowledging the destruction of their immediate ancestors. Yet the Chinese, Egyptians, and Chaldeans, equally with the Hebrews and Hindus, perfectly well know that the year of the flood was the year of the world 1656, or 1680 prophetic years from the creation. One nation writes "seven days;" another "168 Σαροι, or 604800 years;" while some authors, rejecting the fractions write, "after sixty myriads of years (days) were completely ended;" others, "after 3888756 years;" others, "when 32670000 years were passed." And there are some, who consider 240 years as a day; but this alludes to the great prophetic day. These numbers, reduced, all denote the same year of the world, or A. M. 1656. The first, or seven days, is found by multiplying the Matires of a day of 24 hours, by the number of prophetic days, and reducing them by the days in a prophetic year. The quotient is 1680. For $864000 \times 7 \div 360 = 1680$.

The second 168 Σαροι, or 604800 years, is the same number, found by a different calculation. The Σαροι denoting ten years, 168 Σαροι are equal to 1680 years; and 604800 are the number of days in those years. For $604800 \div 360 = 1680$.

The third, 3888756, is found, by adding the sum of the three first ages to that portion of the fourth, which is past. A. M. 1656 answers to the year of the Cali age 756: the aggregate of the three first ages amounts to 3888000. For $1728000 + 1296000 + 864000 = 3888000$; and $3888000 + 756 = 3888756$. As the sum of the three first ages, or 3888000 denotes 900 years, so $900 + 756 = 1656$; and A. M. 1656 is the same date as that of 1680 prophetic years.

The fourth, 3267000, denotes the year of the Cali age, when the deluge happened. For 3267000 is to 756, as 3888000 is to 900: and $900 + 756 = 1656$.

The prophetic great day of 240 years is nothing more than a variety of the first calculation. For $240 \times 360 = 86400$. Wherefore, 240 multiplied by 7, equally gives 1680 years: and accordingly, an hundred and twenty years sometimes denote 840 years, and sometimes seven days. Because $840 \div 120 = 7$.

From the foregoing we may venture to pronounce, that the several nations had a perfect knowledge of the epoch assigned by the Hebrews for the general deluge. But they go further. They tell us the dynasties that ended at that epoch, and those that commenced the following year. The Hindus, in general terms, inform us,

that the Lunar dynasty then became totally extinct; and, in many of their legends, they particularize, by saying, the king who then reigned was of the tenth generation. For example, Mavaliporam the magnificent residence of the great house of Bali was founded by a grandson of Prathaud, mentioned in the fourth Avatar. The stately palaces, august temples, and stupendous edifices of this once magnificent city, are universally believed by every Hindu, whether learned or unlearned, to have been destroyed by "a general deluge brought upon the earth, by the immediate mandate of the supreme God." They still shew the chasm in the rock, that forms one of the largest choultrys; and the divided sculpture but too plainly shews that nothing less than such a convulsion of nature could have rent so large a mass of solid stone, leaving the divided sculpture on each side the chasm, evidently denoting that it was carved before the convulsion took place. This is a truth too apparent to be denied. But Mr. Maurice concludes his history of the fifth Avatar, by saying "the *fable* of the destruction of this capital by an inundation caused by the *immediate* mandate of the *Gods*, naturally inclines us to suspect those *allegorists* of confounding a deluge which subverted a great city, with a greater deluge which inundated the whole earth." This observation was necessary

to support his hypothesis that Bali was descended from the Rajahs of Delhi of the name of Bal. Here the geographic information of this author is as erroneous, as his historic and chronological details are unfounded. Delhi is a province of Bengal, Mavaliporam a town situated near to Madras, on the Coromandel coast. Prathaud, from having been born in the house of Hirina-hassiak, was considered as his heir. He was of the fifth generation in the line of Atri, or the Moon; the Maha Bali of the fifth Avatar, who, in the early part of his life, was eminently mild, virtuous, and religious; but when he had attained the summit of his ambition he became so arrogant that his kingdom was taken from him by Vishnu, and given to the Soors, or children of the Sun. The generations are given as follows :

4. Hirinakassah the brother of Hirinacheren.
5. Prathaud.
6. Namachee.
7. Bali, the founder of Mavaliporam.
8. Banacheron.
9. Name omitted.
10. Malecheron, in whose time was the great deluge.

These we must suppose to have been the generations of the illegitimate race of Lunar princes. We

have seen that those of the fourth generation were usurpers, and those of the fifth illegitimate. It therefore appears probable, that, when Prathaud, of the fifth generation, was deposed by the Solar race, he retired to the coast of Coromandel, and founded the city of Mavaliporam, where his descendants erected those stupendous edifices, which are still the wonder of mankind. The Brahmans admit, that, for a whole generation, Mavaliporam was deserted; when Malecheron returned, repaired, and added to the capital, by building magnificent palaces and temples roofed with gold, and floored with ivory: that, during his reign, impiety increased so greatly, that the supreme God let loose the billows of the deep, for the destruction of the whole race. By Malecheron is certainly intended the contemporary of Noah in an illegitimate race. For in this list, the ten generations are given without noticing them as kings in succession: whereas the Chaldeans fix the epoch of the deluge at 1680 years of 360 days; and then tell us, that the sum of the generation of patriarchs was ten; of whom six in the race of Cain, exclusive of Alorus or Adam, became sovereigns in succession: that their collected reigns lasted 740 years of 360 days, which reached to the deluge; and that the contemporary of the last generation was Sisuthrus, the son of Ardates, who was

saved in an ark. If, therefore, the Brahmans of [Mavaliporam are correct in their account, Sisuthrus was the contemporary of Malecheron.

If we proceed to the Chinese history, we find nearly a similar, although a less perfect account of the antediluvians, but a yet more explicit account of the first ruler in the postdiluvian world. For we have the year of his birth, as well as the year of his rule or reign; the former is placed at A. M. 1056, which meets the Hebrew text; and his rule at A. M. 1649, the year in which his father died. They speak decisively, in respect to the year of the flood: which is not only placed at 1680 prophetic years, but is particularized by Confucius, as being the 756th year of the Cali age. They likewise make Yau the first postdiluvian ruler, the eighth ruler of the world. The Chinese profess to have no records that can be depended on, prior to the rule of Yau. Nevertheless, I am inclined to think that a diligent and unprejudiced researcher might find abundant antediluvian information. Couplet was a most diligent, but most prejudiced historian. Presupposing Fo-hi to be Noah, he has wrested every transaction to answer that chimaera. Fo-hi was the first-created, the parent of mankind: "Fo-hi the son of heaven," could never be intended for Noah, the son of Lamech. Fo-hi was of the first generation; Noah of the

tenth: Yau became the first ruler of the new world, the year after the deluge, stated, as we have seen, at A. M. 1656; but he is supposed to have commenced his rule in the old world on the death of his father, seven years sooner, or A. M. 1649, the year that Chi died. The genealogy is given as follows:

1. Fo-hi.
2. Shing-nang.
3. Whang-ti.
4. Shau-han.
5. Chwen-Hyo.
6. Ti-co.
7. Ci-e.

. Of these seven kings, the Chinese do not profess to have any certain knowledge respecting the year when their several reigns commenced, or the duration thereof; further than that Fo-hi, the first ruler, was considered as a king for 115 years; and that Ci-e, the seventh emperor, was the last in the old world. Couplet places the commencement of the reign of his successor, Yau, at the year B. C. 2357, or A. M. 1649. This is evidently a supposititious date, inferred from *Chi*, who was not an emperor, having died at that period. It is difficult to determine, from which race the Chinese give the genealogy of the six princes between

Fo-hi or Adam, and Yau or Noah. Neither is it very material. Since both the Hebrews and Hindus admit six rulers, in succession, in the race of Seth; and the Chaldeans and Egyptians the same number in that of Cain. So that, from which ever race the princes, recorded by the Chinese, descended, the numbers agree; making Adam the first, and Noah the eighth ruler in succession from the creation, and the first postdiluvian ruler. Neither can we decide, with certainty, from which of the sons of Noah China was peopled. The situation of the country, and the pure religion first observed in it, leads to the supposition of their being of the race of Shem. But if Navaret is correct, in placing the period when the country was first peopled at about 131 years after the deluge, it appears that they went immediately from Babylon. This is no otherwise material, than as it would enable us to discover the race from which the six princes in the antediluvian world descended. For the race of Shem invariably gives us those of Seth, and the race of Ham those of Cain. The few dates, which we are able to collect, lead us to suppose that the antediluvian princes were of the former race, and that the postdiluvian Chinese descended from Japheth. Let us compare the little we know of their history with that of the Hindus. The latter commence their antediluvian

dynasties with the third generation, during the fourth century; placing Icshwacu at the head of the Solar race. The Chinese do the same; placing Wang-ti of the third generation at the head of their dynasty. The Hindus admit Swayambhuva and his immediate son, the ancestor of Icshwacu, to have been supreme rulers before Icshwacu became such: the Chinese admit Fo-hi, and his immediate son, the ancestor of Whang-ti, to have been sovereign rulers before he became such. The Hindus give all the princes, who governed over provinces, commencing with the sons of Swarochisha, the son of the first-created: the Chinese give all the princes who governed over provinces commencing with the sons of Shin-Nang, the son of the first-created. The genealogical table of the Chinese will be found in Couplet. How far the names are correct, I will not determine. The dates are generally omitted, and the inferences drawn by Couplet invariably false. The number of years assigned to the several reigns, with the exception of the two first are totally without foundation. For the Chinese very correctly place the death of the third emperor, inclusive of Adam, at 515 years before the deluge: Consequently, the intervening space must have been divided between the four princes who reigned from the death of Wang-ti to the deluge, to whom

Couplet allows only 240 years. The fictitious number of 115 years, assigned for the reign of Fo-hi, was merely to make the intervening number of years 724, between the death of Adam and the flood, agree with the reign of the six princes as has been already explained*. To regulate this chronology we must add the 817 years, which every nation admits from the commencement of the Antara, Chon, or creation of the first-created, to the period from whence they date his regal state. The three first reigns would then stand as follows:

$$\begin{array}{r}
 \text{Fohi } 817 + 115 = 932 \\
 \text{Shin-nang} \dots\dots\dots 108 \\
 \text{Whang-ti} \dots\dots\dots 100 \\
 \hline
 1140
 \end{array}$$

This nearly corresponds with the Hebrew text, which assigns to the life of Adam 931 years, to the reign of Seth 112, and Enos 98. For $931 + 112 + 98 = 1141$: which is a strong indication, that the princes were of the race of Seth. The Chinese, like the Hindus, have various modes of reckoning. They, likewise, record that at the end of the third age, Fo-hi closed his mortal career; assigning, therefore, only 900 years to his reign.

* Vide pages 290 and 291.

They sometimes add the overplus to the next reign, and state the reigns as follows :

Fo-hi died A. M....	900
Shin-nang reigned .	140 years.
Whang-ti.....	100
	<hr/>
	1140.

Of the four following reigns, I know nothing. But we may conjecture a great deal. The Chinese furnish a genealogical table, ill-arranged, and very difficult to understand, evidently erroneous in all its minor details ; but, as they confess that very little credit is due to it, we must be content to glean a few truths, wherever they present themselves. The arrangement of Couplet, although ingenious, renders the subject yet more obscure. He rejects all dates, because they militate against his hypothesis, that Fo-hi was Noah : from the Chinese we learn one great truth ; that “ Fo-hi, was the general father of mankind, and that those who pretend to carry the world further back, are allegorists : that this Fo-hi had no parents,*and, as such was considered the son of heaven : that he had three distinguished sons : that from the first, and third, two great dynasties descended, but from the second there was no issue :” which corresponds with the Hebrew text, Abel being the second son of Adam. The table may be considered so far as it goes, as follows :

TABLE XXIV.

•	1 Fo-hi.	Third family.
	Second family.	
	Hey-en-tou.	2 Shin-hang.
	No descendants.	3 Whang-ti died A. M. 1140.
	With the exception of	4 Shan-han.
	Chwen-hyo*, who is	5 Chwen-hyo.
	placed at the head of	6 Ti-co.
	the fifth dynasty, the	7 Cie died A. M. 1656.
	names of the kings	Chi 1648.
	who became sove-	Yau born . . . 1056
	reigns of the world	
	are not given.	

* Chwen-hyo was the Dasaratha of India ; the Mahalaleel of Scripture, who ruled over both lines for about 55 years.

The foregoing amendment will make this table tolerably correct, if I am so, in supposing the third son of Fo-hi to be Seth. Then, with the exception of Enoch, who, being considered a God, is not mentioned among the kings, we find the

generation of patriarchs complete. Of the two latter, the Chinese record, that Chi never became an emperor, and that the reign of Yau commenced one year after the deluge: Ci-e is admitted, in all the accounts, to have been the eldest son of Ti-co, probably his grandson; but he was in the direct line of succession, and it is expressly said, that the reign of the seventh emperor ended with the deluge, and that his successor Yau, the eighth emperor commenced his reign one year after, or "the year after the flood of Yau." We are, therefore, authorized in placing A. M. 1656 against the name of Ci-e, admitting that Ci-e, was Methuselah, and Chi, Lamech; which I have no doubt was the case. Chi, although the father of Yau, dying several years before his father, could not have been an emperor. Couplet makes the aggregate of the reign of the six princes 480 years, assigning to Shin-nang 140, to Whang-ti 100, to Shan-han 84, to Chwen-Hyo 78, to Ti-co 70, to Chi 8. These are evidently supposititious dates. The death of Whang-ti, the inventor of the cycle of 60, appears the only marked epoch. Besides which, the missionary introduces Chi, whom no Chinese considers as an emperor, and omits Ci-e, whose reign reached to the deluge. The Chinese do not divide the number of years, during which the six princes reigned; yet they ascertain the aggregate, by adding 115

years to the given sum of 817 ; making from the creation of Fo-hi to his death 932 years ; and placing the deluge at A. M. 1656. The intervening space, by implication, is, therefore, understood to be 724 years, for the reign of the six intervening princes. How far these alterations are admissible you must determine. I shall proceed to compare the coincidence of events with that of dates. Fo-hi designated Tyen-tsi, or the son of heaven, like Swayambhuva, who sprang from the Self-created, had two distinguished sons ; from whom two great dynasties sprang, who governed the antediluvian world. Each nation records, that the division of the world, or the forming the country into districts, over which rulers of each race were placed, was during the third generation, commencing with the immediate sons of the two sons of the first-created. At this period (during the fourth century) Sanchoniatho, equally with Berösus, informs us, that the race of Cain lived without rule or order, the sexes mixing together like the beasts of the field ; that the children were named by their mothers, the fathers being uncertain ; that they lived in huts, and covered their bodies with the skins of wild beasts, pouring the blood of such beasts on stones, and stumps of wood, before which they bowed down and worshipped. Berösus adds, “ in the first year after the return of this race,

the Oannes appeared, for the purpose of reforming them. We have seen that the return of this race was A. M. 413, and the commencement of their rule A. M. 474. The first year, probably meant, the first year of their return; for we must suppose them somewhat reformed before they were appointed rulers. As the Musaris Oannes, or fish-deity denotes Enoch, so does the Oannes, Adam; who instructed these new comers in every kind of knowledge. He infused into them a knowledge of right and wrong, instructed them in every science, directed them how to build temples, and houses; to collect seeds, and the various fruits of the earth for their nutriment: in short, as their general father, he spared no pains to soften their manners, and improve their morals:" such is the account we receive from Berosus, let us compare it with that of the Chinese.

" In those early times men differed little from beasts; they knew their mothers but not their fathers; they were uncivilized and rude; they never eat but when pressed by hunger, and when that was satisfied they threw away what was left; they swallowed the hair, drank the blood, and cloathed themselves with the skins of animals: Fo-hi taught them how to make fishing-nets and snares for birds, also to rear domestic animals, as

well for food as for sacrifice. To mitigate the natural fierceness of his new subjects, and calm wild and turbulent spirits, Fo-hi invented music." We might proceed to an unpardonable length. Sufficient has been said to prove, that Sancho-niatho and Berosus were treating of the same period with the Chinese; and then I should just as soon suppose Noah to represent Adam as Fo-hi. Who were the new subjects of Noah? Noah ruled over his own sons only. Every nation that admits the deluge, gives the immediate ancestor of the pious prince, who was saved in the ark. Why should the Chinese alone suppose he had no parents? The knowledge of the Chinese, relative to Fo-hi, or Adam, is very circumscribed. It is confined to a decided belief of his wisdom and piety, and that he softened and humanized the manners of his new *subjects*, after their return. Of the prince saved in the ark they have a more comprehensive knowledge. They place his birth at A. M. 1053, his succeeding his father as a ruler, at A. M. 1649; and the commencement of his reign immediately after the flood, which they suppose to have happened during the 756th year of the Cali age, or A. M. 1656. We will next accompany the Chinese into the postdiluvian world; when, according to Couplet, Yau commenced his reign A. M. 1650. But the

missionary calculates the reign from the death of Chi A. M. 1649, not recollecting that Chi, like Lamech, the father of Noah, never succeeded to regal power. To obviate this difficulty, Couplet not only alters the cycle, but the year of the cycle in which the deluge took place; that it might correspond with the reign of Yau, which he places in the forty-first, in lieu of the forty-seventh, year of the cycle.

Yau of the Chinese, like Noah of the Hebrews, Sisuthrus of the Chaldeans, and Vaivaswata of the Hindus, is represented as a prince of exemplary virtue. He, like them, was the eighth ruler of the world, and the first king that reigned after the deluge. But here they become divaricate: for, although an immediate descendant of the eighth monarch, is placed by each nation at the head of the ninth dynasty, yet neither supposes him the ruler of the *whole world*. On the contrary, a son of such descendant is by each nation stated as at the head of the tenth dynasty from the creation, and the first king of that country where they settled. The third in descent from Noah, was the first king of Egypt; the third from Sisuthrus the first king of Chaldea: the third from Vaivaswat the first king of Magadha; the third from Yau, the first emperor of China.

The eighth emperor Yau succeeded his father
in the 41st year of a cycle, and became
sovereign of the world, in the 47th year
of the same cycle, i. e. A. M. 1657

The ninth emperor Shun commenced his
reign about A. M. 1752

The tenth emperor Yu was the first emperor
of the first imperial dynasty of China, and
commenced his reign A. M. 1797

From this period, the chronology of the Chinese is very correct. They, like every other nation, have a general knowledge of the first postdiluvian ruler. They record the year in which he was born, the year when his immediate predecessor or father died, and the year when he became sovereign of the world. All of which agrees with the Hebrew text. They represent him as wise, just and religious, employing the first years of his reign in draining the low lands from the waters of the deluge; and the subsequent period, in framing wise and prudent laws, for the government of his subjects. They admit of one intervening generation between this prince and their first emperor, the commencement of whose reign is fixed at A. M. 1797, when their history begins: which establishes the fact that neither Yau nor Shun ever reached

China. On the fullest conviction that Noah and Yau are intended for the same person, I shall proceed to compare the occurrences recorded in the life of each.

Noah was the eighth ruler of the world, inclusive, from Adam.

Yau was the eighth ruler of the world, inclusive, from Fo-hi.

Noah was a preacher of righteousness.

Yau was so righteous, that to be compared to him was considered as the highest encomium.

Noah began his reign the year after the deluge
A. M. 1657.

Yau began his reign the year after the deluge in the Cali year 757, or A. M. 1657: the first act of his reign was to drain the water from the low lands of his kingdom.

Noah reigned before he divided the country between his sons 100 years.

Yau reigned 100 years.

Noah's three sons, being settled in the different countries assigned to them, he was not succeeded in the country, where he sojourned, by any of them.

Yau was not succeeded in the country where he

sojourned, by either of his sons ; but by a descendant, who assisted in draining the lands.

Mizraim of the third generation from Noah, inclusive, formed the first Egyptian dynasty.

Yu of the third generation from Yau, inclusive, formed the first Chinese dynasty.

These circumstances are at least proof presumptive, that Yau was no other than Noah. Couplet endeavours to obviate this, by saying, Fo-hi began his reign in the year B. C. 2952, and reigned 115 years. In conjectural matters, there is no worse authority than Couplet ; although, as a researcher, we are indebted to him. Convinced in his own mind, that Fo-hi was Noah, he interprets every thing, so as to accord therewith ; and whenever the Chinese treat of their first emperor, whether Fo-hi, Yau, or Yu, (for each are occasionally so designated*), he invariably supposes them to mean Fo-hi. Reading that the *Chau* of the first emperor began in the year B. C. 2952, he records that *Fo-hi* began his reign at that period. Whereas the original Chinese record implied that *Yau* the first ruler in the postdiluvian world was *born* at that period. For the *Chau* of the Chinese, like the Antara of the Hindu patriarchs, neither

* Fo-hi as first-created, Yau as first in the new world, Yu as first emperor of China.

implied dynasty nor reign, but the time or duration of such person, his sojourn on earth. The Antara of a Menu was 857 years; because the life of the ten patriarchs from the creation averaged that number of years; the Antara of the six Egyptian princes was 664 years; because their lives averaged that period, from the rule of Cain: the Antara of Swayambhuva commenced the first year of the creation; the Antara of Vaivaswat A. M. 1656. In like manner the Chinese record the Chou of Yau: which Couplet carries back to the year B. C. 2952, or A. M. 1056; and supposes the commencement of the Chou to be the commencement of the reign. Yet we are not to suppose the Chou of Yau confined to 857 years; that being an average age, as we now say the life of man is threescore and ten, although very many die sooner, and some exceed that term. The life of Noah, the Antara of Vaivaswat, and the Chou of Yan, were 950 years. Each was born 600 years before the deluge, and ruled as sovereign of the world, for one hundred years after it. It is true, the missionaries place the death of this prince at A. M. 1756. But this was his political death; when he divided the world between his sons. And this agrees, within two years, with the Hebrew text. The missionaries always suppose one ruler dead, before another commences his rule. The

reign of the first Chinese emperor began A. M. 1797 ; but neither Yau nor Shun ever reached China. So that their *death* was in no way connected with the rule of the first emperor of the first imperial dynasty in that country. Còuplet, finding that the *Chou* of the *first* emperor commenced in the year B. C. 2952, wrote, "the *reign* of Fo-hi began in the year B. C. 2952 ;" and it is extremely probable, that the generality of the Chinese, like the generality of the Hindus, are incapable of explaining their own history. That very few of them understand their own cypher, we know ; for it is recorded by one of their authors that at *that* time 3267000 years were passed. This has been variously interpreted : some supposing that time to denote the age of the world, when Confucius wrote. Others more correctly suppose it to allude to the period of which he wrote, the reign of Yau and the deluge. Thus the 3267000 years are a part of 4320000, answering to 756 years. For 3888000, the sum of the three first ages, is to 900 years, as 3267000 is to 756. Confucius lived during the Cali age when about 2600 years of it were passed. Had he written that the deluge happened in the 756th year of that age, the age of the world had been ascertained. He therefore wrote, "at that time 3267000 years were passed." Now the deluge

took place in that year: for $900 + 756 = 1656$. And this number, so described, was equally expressive of the birth of Noah, the commencement of his reign in the new world, and of the deluge. For, as, in one sense, it explained the year, in which the deluge took place, and consequently the commencement of the reign of the first post-diluvian ruler, so did it in another sense indicate the commencement of his Chou. For, rejecting the cypher, $4320,000 - 3267,000 = 1053^*$. And it is a very usual thing with oriental nations to make their cypher answer to several events.

The chronology of Couplet is particularly objectional, although in many instances he draws his information from authentic sources. When he confines himself to years before Christ, he is nearly correct in most of his dates; but when he treats of cycles, he is invariably mistaken. And in his genealogical table, he has rendered the very confused account given by the Chinese, still more so, by blending the princes of the old world with those of the new. This, however, was necessary, to support the assertion that Fo-hi, the first-created, was the first ruler of the new world: from this

* The missionaries calculated on this date, placing the year of Christ A. M. 4004; when they state the reign of this emperor at the year B. C. 2952; the current year being always given to the reign of the preceding emperor.

table it appears, that the Chinese descended from Japheth, the eldest son of Noah. For in Table XXIV, it is shewn that Fo-hi, the son of heaven, had three sons, from the first and third of whom, two distinguished lines descended; no notice being taken of the second, except that his name was Hey-en-tou. From the eldest son, the pedigree, like that of the Chaldeans and Hindus, is only traced from the third descent, or the return of Cain, to the deluge. Whereas the family of the third son, answering to Seth, commences with Fo-hi, reaches to the deluge, and is continued in the person of Yau; whose reign commenced after the deluge, or A. M. 1657. Here, of course, the table should have been divided, and the three families should have recommenced with the sons of Noah; instead of which, the missionary, having probably been told that not only the prince himself, but his three sons, were born during the time of the first rulers, of whom Fo-hi was the chief, and forgetting that Noah and his three sons were born during the rule of the antediluvian patriarchs, carries the pedigree forward from Fo-hi, without marking the period when the deluge divided the old from the new world. And reading that Yu was a descendant of the *eldest son* of the *first emperor*, that is, of the eldest son of Noah, or Yau, whose Chou began A. M. 1056, he places the first

emperor, of the first Chinese dynasty, as a descendant of the eldest son of Fo-hi (Adam); although he admits that Yu began his reign 143 years after the deluge. From this we may infer that the Chinese descended from Japheth, the eldest son of Noah. Again, at a loss how to dispose of a third race, the missionary engrafts the sons of the second house of Noah, on the stock of the second house of Fo-hi, who had no issue during the antediluvian world. The pedigree of Couplet is like that of Wilford; each collects, with much diligence, names and families, but ruins the whole genealogy, to support the assertion, that the pedigree was postdiluvian; making the first Menu, and Fo-hi, from whom the whole world is said to have been peopled, Noah.

The Chinese profess to be ignorant of the year, when the cycle of 60 was first introduced, although they record that it was invented by Whang-ti, who died more than 700 years before the reign of *their* first emperor (Yu), who regulated time thereby. From which the missionary supposes the period, which he assigns for the first year of the first cycle, to be the first year of the reign of the prince who invented it. It does not follow, because the cycle was invented by Whang-ti, that it commenced with his reign. On the contrary, Couplet admits that "by the assist-

ance of a person named Ta-nu-o he perfected the cycle of 60 years:" clearly evincing, that his reign could not have commenced with the first year of *the* first cycle, although the year which the missionary states as the first of his reign, was actually the first year of *a* cycle. A. M. 1309 was, according to the Hindus, the commencement of the ninth cycle. The Chinese profess that Whang-ti, the third ruler of the world in succession, after having regulated his kingdom, created six Kelau, or ministers, to assist in the government thereof; to each of which he assigned the perfecting of some particular science.

Isung-kyan was the mandarin for composing history.

Ta-nu-o was employed to perfect the cycle of 60.

Yong-ching was enjoined to arrange the sphere and calendar.

Li-chew's office was to regulate numbers and measures.

Ling-lan was entrusted with the improvement of music.

Yong-yiven was ordered to form twelve bells, to mark the months.

None of the foregoing appear to have been new inventions. On the contrary, mandarins were appointed to perfect those sciences which had pre-

viously been invented: it did not require the aid of a scientific minister, to enable Whang-ti to decide on any given number of years, by which time should be divided. By perfecting the cycle, therefore, we can only understand the arrangement of the roots and branches; that is, so to dispose the 10 roots, and 12 branches, that the same numbers should never occur in the same cycle, by which all confusion was prevented; and for want of which, the Hindus are obliged, even to this day, to assign names to each of the 60 years*. But, whether the cycle was invented or improved by Whang-ti, it is certain that the commencement of his reign could not have been the *first* year of the *first* cycle, if the missionary is correct in placing it at the year B. C. 2697, or A. M. 1309. Because the death of Hoam-ti, or Whang-ti, which is the same (being the third, or yellow emperor, who, as the missionary admits, invented the cycle), is placed by the Chinese at A. M. 1140. As Whang-ti was the third from Fo-hi, so was Enos the third from Adam, in the race of Seth; and, according to the Hebrew text, Enos died A. M. 1141; and, according to the Chaldeans, Amikaruz the third from Alorus, in the race of Cain, died A. M. 1085. Admitting therefore

* Vide Appendix (A).

Fo-hi to mean Noah, then the third in descent from him was not born until A. M. 1659, which is only two years after the deluge: consequently, the *reign* of the third in descent from Fo-hi, whether he were antediluvian or postdiluvian, could not have commenced A. M. 1309. This proves that the first six cycles of Couplet were introduced, and made subservient to that number of years, which, mistaking the Chou for the reign, he assigned for the six princes who reigned between Fo-hi and Yau. We may, therefore, pronounce the whole chronology of Couplet erroneous; at least so far as cycles are concerned. The Chinese antediluvian records are admitted by themselves to be very imperfect. They do not profess to have any *certain* dates before the flood of Yau, further than those which relate to him. Nevertheless, all their historians agree, that the world was divided into two great lines during the third generation from Fo-hi. That Whang-ti was at the head of one of those lines; that he was the third, or yellow, emperor, and that by him the cycle was first invented and afterwards perfected. But of the year in which it commenced they have no certain account; although they trace very accurately the death of the prince who invented it to A. M. 1140, or the 11th year of the 6th cycle. Now the Hindu history throws much light on this subject. Icshwacu,

like Whang-ti, was the third in descent from the first-created ; in his time the world was divided into two great lines, and in his time the cycle of 60 was introduced. The rule of this prince commenced at the beginning of the second age, or A. M. 401, when he was about 160 years of age. The Arabians represent him as well skilled in Natural Philosophy and Astronomy. And the first cycle, at least the first cycle of a cycle of cycles; or period of 3600 years, began about 400 years after the commencement of his rule, or A. M. 829; at which period I have little doubt but that the cycle was first brought into use. This prince could not have reigned, in succession, until the death of his father A. M. 1041. It is, therefore, probable, that the Chinese are correct in stating that, "after his accession to *sovereign* rule," he appointed six Kelau to organize and bring to perfection arts, which he had cultivated before he succeeded to the throne of his father. So might the mandarin Tanuo have organized the cycle; that is, arranged the 10 roots and 12 branches in such a manner, that no two could ever occur in the same year until the cycle was complete. If a grand period commenced A. M. 829, then, as the deluge is placed in the 756th year of the Cali age, it must have commenced in the 47th year of the 14th cycle. Couplet, Du Halde, and all the other

missionaries place the commencement of the first cycle, after the deluge at the year B. c. 2337 ; because A. M. $4006 - 2337 = 1669$; the Brahmans place^{at} the year B. c. 2333, because A. M. $4002 - 2333 = 1669$. But, since the Chinese agree with the Hindus, in placing it in the Cali year 769, the second grand period consequently commenced in the Cali year 3529, or in the 427th year of the Christian era, calculating that epoch at A. M. 4002. If therefore the calculations of the Brahmans are just, as the Cali age commenced in the 12th year of a second cycle, it must have commenced A. M. 901 : and that their calculations are just we learn from this being the ninth year of the 24th cycle of the last grand period*. Which proves, to mathematical demonstration, that the Chinese and Hindu cycles are the same, and that they commenced long before A. M. 1309, which year was the commencement of the ninth, and not of the first cycle. It has, I trust, been clearly proved, that the chronology of Couplet is unfounded. That of the other missionaries is less objectionable. For, unable to ascertain the number of cycles that were passed, they consider them as arbitrary, leaving others to draw their own conclusions. They observe that the first cycle after our epoch of the deluge, commenced in the year B. c. 2337 ; which differs in four years

* Vide Appendix (A).

only from the Chinese chronology, owing to the reasons above given. The missionaries seem aware of this circumstance. For, in giving the history of the reign of Chong-kong the fourth emperor of the first Chinese dynasty, they inform us, "that in the *second* year, or, according to others, the *sixth* year, of the cycle, there happened a remarkable eclipse of the Sun." Missionaries admit the difference of four years.

The Chinese do not, in direct words, tell us the year of the cycle, in which the flood happened. But they tell us, that the reign of Yau commenced after 3267000 years, which answers to the Cali year 757, which, we know, was the 48th year of the 14th cycle, which answers to A. M. 1657; adding, that the first years of his reign were employed in draining off the waters that remained stagnant in the vallies. The missionaries who never distinguish between Chou's reigns and rules, place this epoch seven years further back; which may be cited as a proof of the accuracy of the Chinese records; since Lamech the father of Noah died A. M. 1651. The missionaries place the accession of the son at the death of his father; forgetting that he succeeded his grandfather, who outlived his son. Couplet, therefore, places the commencement of the reign of Yau in the 41st, instead of the 48th year of a cycle; and the

deluge, happening just one year before the reign of Yau, is placed in the 40th, instead of the 47th year of a cycle. The missionary, reading that the great inundation happened *in the Chou* of Yau, concludes that it was during his *reign*. At a loss, therefore, to account for the incongruity of an event happening in the 40th year, when the reign did not commence until the 41st year of the cycle, he carries it forward 59 years, or to the 40th year of the succeeding cycle, which he names the 7th. Now every nation, that records the deluge, speaks of it as having happened in the time of the prince, who was saved in the ark; the Hindus place it in the Antara of Satyavrata; the Chaldeans in the time of Sisuthrus; the Hebrews in the time of Noah; and the Chinese in the Chou of Yau. Thus each nation places the reign of the prince, however named, one year after the commencement of the flood. The account, as given by the missionary, refutes itself. He begins by informing us, that Yau ruled alone for 72 years; that it was the especial care of this prince, by draining the stagnant waters which remained on the low lands after the deluge, to render them fertile. For which purpose he appointed Quen an overseer; who, having betrayed the confidence placed in him, either by neglect or design, was, after nine years, put to death; that his son Yu, desirous to repair

the fault of his father offered his services ; which being accepted he, after thirteen years of hard labour, succeeded, by cutting dykes, levelling mountains, &c. &c. to convey the waters to the sea. After enumerating many acts of virtue and piety, such as the forming of laws &c., the missionary informs us that *Yau* joined a person of the name of *Shun* in the government, who reigned jointly with him for 28 years ; when the government devolved solely to *Shun*. Now, supposing, according to Couplet, if the deluge happened in the 40th year of a cycle, and the reign of *Yau* in the 41st, that by the latter is intended the 40th year of a subsequent cycle, then it must have been just 59 years after the commencement of the reign of *Yau*. The flood remained one year ; and supposing *Quen* to have been appointed the year after, the lands could not have been drained until ten years after the reign of *Yau* had concluded ; for we hear nothing of his colleague *Shun* having assisted in this business : and $59 + 2 + 9 + 13 = 83$; which is just 11 years after *Yau* entrusted the government to *Shun*. In like manner, we may correct every part of the chronology of this missionary, whose error appears to have arisen in a very general mistake, that of understanding the *Chou*, as the reign. But Couplet admits that the reign of *Yau* commenced A. M. 1651, which only differs

in six years from the Hébrew Bible ; and admitting it to have been even somewhat more, it is surely inconsistent in those who mention the impossibility of fixing dates in the early periods of the postdiluvian world, “ without supplying the word *about*, or *nearly*, before every date, since accuracy cannot be attained and ought not to be required*,” to pronounce so trifling a difference as six years, fatal to the Chinese chronology : particularly when we consider these six years as a part of sixteen hundred, which elapsed more than four thousand years past. Such, however, is the fact : for the same author proceeds to inform us, that, after full inquiry and consideration he was convinced that “ the Chinese, like the Hindus, believed this earth to have been wholly covered with water ; which, in works of *undoubted* authority, they describe as flowing abundantly, then subsiding, and separating the higher from the lower age of mankind.†” The knowledge of the Chinese relative to the deluge is thereby admitted. But, lest it should be understood according to its true and obvious meaning, he goes on to explain, that the deluge, which “ *caused the division of time*, just preceded the appearance of Fo-hi on the mountains of Chin. For the *great*

* Sir William Jones, Vol. IV. p. 43. and the beginning of Letter II. of this Work.

† Sir William Jones, Vol. III. p. 153.

inundation, in the *time* of Yau was either confined to the low lands of his kingdom, if the whole account of it be not a fable, or if it contain any allusion to the flood of Noah, has been ignorantly misplaced by the Chinese annalists." If the Chinese annalists, who place the deluge of Yau in the same year that the Hebrews place the flood of Noah, are accounted ignorant, from an error of *six* years, in placing the reign of Yau in that year, when his *rule* is supposed to have began, qualifying the error by observing that his *reign* commenced the year after the great inundation; what may we not account those, who place the commencement of the reign of Fo-hi at the year B. C. 2952 or A. M. 1054, who assign 115 years for his reign, and place his death just 487 years before the flood, or in the year B. C. 2837, and then insist that the deluge, which caused the division between the old and new world, just preceded the appearance of Fo-hi on the mountains of Chin? if the Chinese annalists err in six years, European annalists err in six hundred: the Chinese might fairly retort, and say, that if the account, so given of the flood of Noah, was not altogether a fable, or had any allusion to the flood of Yau, it had been ignorantly misplaced by European annalists. Among the various writers on Chinese Chronology, not one presumes even on a partial inundation, so far back

as A. M. 1054. But the followers of the postdiluvian system, finding it impossible to bring Fo-hi forward to the deluge, carry the deluge back to Fo-hi; pronounce him the person saved in the ark, the eighth person; and place his reign just two years before Noah was born; in direct opposition to the Chinese, who pronounce all those who pretend that any human being existed before Fo-hi, allegorists. That their astronomical observations might appear as incorrect as their historical ones, finding that a Chinese author places the conjunction of the five planets in the reign of *their* fifth emperor, we are told that it was in the reign of *the* fifth emperor; making a difference of more than 500 years, and placing a remarkable event, which occurred during the reign of Tis-yang, the fifth emperor of China, in the reign of Chwen-hyo, the fifth emperor of the world. This conjunction is likewise mentioned by P. Cassiano.

Navaret is of opinion, that the *reign* of the first postdiluvian ruler was long subsequent to the year of the world 1054; very properly distinguishing between the birth and the reign of Noah. He likewise places the first kings of China about 131 years after the deluge. The Chinese annalists, in general, place the commencement of the reign of Yu, the first emperor of China, 143 years after the flood of Yau; and it is probable, from the

dispersion which took place at Babylon, even supposing it an hundred and thirty years after the flood, that 12 or 13 years should have elapsed, before the government of China was established.

That neither Noah, nor that son of his, from whom the Chinese descended ever reached that country appears certain. The great age of the patriarch, and the great distance of China from the mountain, where the ark is supposed to have rested, made it impossible for the former; and the Chinese, who appear to have a correct account, from the deluge, of all material events, affirm that their *first* emperor was of the *third* generation from Yau; which could not have been so, had an immediate son of Noah migrated to that country. As it is admitted that the Chinese have a perfect knowledge of the deluge, that Fo-hi was the first ruler of the world, and Yau the eighth, and as all the missionaries agree, that the commencement of the reign of the latter was not earlier than A. M. 1650, it follows that the six princes who ruled between Fo-hi and Yau were antediluvian. Of the race, from which they descended, we cannot speak with certainty. For, although the accession of Yau being placed in the year that Lamech died is strong presumptive evidence; yet as the number of years which each of the six princes reigned is not given by any Chinese author, we

cannot pronounce with certainty on the subject. The number of years assigned by Couplet for each reign is evidently fictitious. For having mistaken the birth of Noah, for the reign of Adam, he places that epoch at A. M. 1054, and allots 115 years for its duration. Consequently he had only 480 disposable years, to divide between the six reigns that preceded that of Yau, which he admits to have commenced A. M. 1650 : whereas every other nation allots from 724 to 728 years. The chronology of Couplet must be erroneous. For whether Fo-hi was Adam, or Noah, his reign could neither have commenced A. M. 1054, nor his death have taken place A. M. 1169. The subsequent numbers are, therefore, necessarily erroneous. That the Chinese state the reign of Fo-hi at 115 years is certain. But it forms a part of the 932 years, during which they suppose that he lived. That nearly every oriental nation should place the commencement of the reign of the first-created just 817 years from the creation, proves that some tradition was extant relative thereto. For each nation differs in respect to the length of his reign, so as to make it meet the period at which they place his death. The Egyptians allot 83 years; the Chaldeans 100; and the Chinese 115 : because the Egyptians, who like the Hindus, reckon in round numbers, state the death of the

first-created, when the three first ages were completely passed; or at the end of 900 years; so $817 + 83 = 900$. The Chaldeans state it at 917 years; so $817 + 100 = 917$: the Chinese at 932 years; so $817 + 115 = 932$. The reason that regulated the number of years affixed as the duration of the reign of the first-created, evidently arose from the different lengths of the years, by which the different nations calculated, increasing and decreasing the portion of time allotted for the six princes, between the first ruler of the old, and new world. Why each nation should have fixed on 817 years of 365 days and 6 hours, as the life of the first-created, before his reign commenced, is a question worth investigating. The several nations who assigned ~~83~~ 83, or 115 years, for the reign of the first-created, certainly did not intend those numbers to denote the whole duration of his reign, but the number of years he reigned from a given epoch, or the cycle of 60 years. For 817 years of 365 days and 6 hours, are equal to 829 of 360 days; and it is certain that the cycle commenced in the 829th year of the world. Oriental chronology is so ill understood, that we cannot be surprised at the years being mistaken. Nearly every Greek author who has copied from Berosus, has fallen into the same error. The Chaldean priest allotted

74 *Σαροι*, for the reign of the six princes, and ten for that of Alorus, making in all 840 years. The reign of 'Sisuthrus being in the postdiluvian world, is placed at A. M. 1657, and the 840 years assigned by Berosus for the seven reigns were deducted therefrom, leaving 817 years as the commencement of the cycle. But the 84 *Σαροι* of Berosus contained only 302400 days, or 828 Julian years, which deducted from A. M. 1657 leaves 829 years, the true epoch when the cycle of 60 commenced*. This equally applies to every other eastern nation. The reign of the antediluvian princes being reckoned in years of 360 days, and deducted from the year of the world in which the reign of Noah in the postdiluvian world commenced, or 1657 years of 365 days and 6 hours; a convincing proof that each nation place the epoch of the deluge in the same year. Oriental nations do not meet us at the top of every page with an *Anno Mundi*, but they generally furnish us with documents, that answer the same purpose. The Chinese neither give us the number of years that formed the sum of the reigns of the six princes, nor the number of years each reigned. But we gather from their accounts, that it was 724: because they place the end of the reign of the first-created at A. M.

* Vide Appendix (A).

932, and the deluge at A. M. 1656. Again, we trace the death of the third emperor to A. M. 1140; consequently, from that period to the deluge was 516 years: the Hebrews state it at 515*. Although the grand periods, such as cycles, periods of 3600 years, and the four ages, are the same with those introduced by the Hindus, it must nevertheless be recollected, that the Hindu tables will not decypher all Chinese dates; because their division of time is different. The Chinese day and night consist of 12 hours only; their hour being twice the length of our's. The first six, or day, commences at midnight; the second six, or night, at noon. These twelve hours are divided into an hundred equal parts, and each part into an hundred minutes. So that their day, or from midnight to midnight consists of 10000 minutes: They have likewise other divisions of time, for astronomical purposes.

The most determined opposer of the antediluvian system, is Mr. Bryant. In his new system of ancient mythology, he not only supposes all the dynasties postdiluvian, but affirms that Noah was the first of men. I cannot leave this subject without answering the objections which he produces in proof of the dynasties copied from Berosus being

* Vide page 100, and 288.

the progeny of Noah ; because on these arguments the Solar and Lunar dynasties have been so considered. He informs us that " by following his system we may be enabled to detect and refute the absurdities of Abydenus and Apollodorus ; who pretend, on the authority of Berosus to produce ten antediluvian kings." (Vol. IV. p. 142.) And again, in page 151, he gives us to understand that these absurdities originate in the wilful misrepresentation of Eusebius ; " for whatever kings may have reigned in Babylon, or in Chaldea, they have had their series reversed ; and, by a groundless anticipation, have been referred to another period ; but if we turn the tables and reduce the series to its original order, we shall find Sisuthrus the patriarch stand first ; and those that are brought between him and Alorus will come after. For Alorus will be found to be no other than *Nimrod* the son of *Cush*. He is by Berosus truly styled *Χαλδαῖος*, one of the Chusdim or Chaldeans, and represented as the first king of Babylon. He was, indeed, the first that reigned upon earth." Again, " our Scripture having *idly* followed the Greeks and the Romans renders Chaldeus, that which should be Chusdim or Chasdim." If we admit such assertions as proofs, we may reject every text that militates against the system that is most consonant to our views. We have seen, that

Chucshusha was the name given both by the Hindus and Egyptians to the great ancestor of Noah. These nations equally name the land, which was the residence of the antediluvian monarchs, Carucshatra; and place the residence of our first parent west of Cushadweep. It is therefore more consonant to reason, and to the usage of mankind, to suppose that the country alluded to, whether named Chaldeus, Chaldea, Chasdim, or Chusdim, was so named from the great ancestor of Noah, Chucshusha; who was a native of Carucsha, than that it should have been named after his descendant in the fifth or sixth generation. It is infinitely more likely that Cush took his name from his ancestor Chucshusha, than that Chaldea was named after Cush. Moreover, the city of Chaldea, or Babylon, is said to have been built before either Cush or Nimrod became rulers. It was built by Ham, on his first settling in those parts; and, we read, in the Scripture, that the beginning of the kingdom of Nimrod* was when he *seized* on the city of Babylon, which was about sixty years after Ham had finally retired thence into Canaan, leaving his son Cush in the govern-

* Moses, therefore, calls him Nimrod, or the rebel: He assumed the name of Nin or Ninus, signifying the *Son*, or Nin the son of Cush.

ment, whose reign is stated at fifty-five years : consequently, Nimrod was the third instead of the first king of Babylon, and could not have assumed the government sooner than A. M. 1960. The assertion, therefore, of Mr. Bryant, that "Nimrod was indeed the first who reigned upon earth," is but a feeble support of the argument which he urges in proof of Alorus and Nimrod being the same. But Nimrod aspired to no such honour. It is recorded of him, that after he had conquered many nations, and built the city of Nineveh, he*, in a public assembly of the Babylonians, extolled his grandfather Ham as the founder of the empire of Babylon, deemed him worthy of canonization, and exhibited a statue of him, which he ordered to be worshipped in a magnificent temple of that city. By Bishop Cumberland's tables, from Eratosthenes it appears that Mizraim reigned in Egypt an hundred and eleven years, before Nimrod is said to have seized on the kingdom of Babylon. But Bryant, having established to his own satisfaction that Alorus was Nimrod, and that Nimrod was the first monarch that ruled upon earth, in his instructions how to confute the absurdities of the Greeks, completely overthrows his

* Annal. Salion. Anno Mundi 2000, and Hieron upon Ezekiel and Hosea,

own hypothesis: for, if the series had been inverted, this "primeval king, the first who ruled on earth," would have been the tenth, instead of the first king of Babylon. "The Grecians (he informs us) not knowing, or not attending to, the eastern mode of writing, have introduced these ten kings, in the first book, which Berosus refers to the second. They often inverted the names of persons as well as places, and have ruined whole dynasties through ignorance of arrangement. What the orientals wrote from right to left, they were apt to confound by a wrong disposition, and to describe in an inverted sense. Hence those supposed kings, who, according to Berosus, were subsequent to the deluge, and to the patriarch, are made prior to both: and he who stands first is made later by ten generations, through a reversion of the true order*." Here we find this first of men, and first of kings, made the contemporary of Abraham; being placed in the tenth generation from the deluge. Let us examine the reasoning on this subject. First, if Apollodorus and Abydenus were ignorant of the manner in which the orientals wrote, how were they able to collect the sense of the original text which they translated? Secondly, how could the commencement of a line

* Bryant, vol. IV. p. 144.

from the right, instead of the left, transpose a work, from the second to the first book? And, thirdly, admitting that Berosus wrote in such a manner, it would be difficult to prove therefrom that Anadophus, the son of Acdoreschus, was born two generations before his grandfather Daus. The sentence is as follows.

INT. SUHQODANA DEDEECOUS SUAC ЯЕТТА
 .SUHQSEBODCA FO NOS

Those, that have been in the habit of reading oriental languages, well know the facility, with which such a mode of writing is understood. Mr. Bryant then reverts to what he styles the "contradictory accounts given of the Oannes:" we have seen that Abydenus places the Musaris Oannes, the fish-deity, in the time of Amillarus. "In his time, a semi-dæmon called Annedotus, in appearance very like to Oannes shewed himself a *second* time from the sea:" Apollodorus was speaking of his appearance at a subsequent period, in a different province, governed by a different prince who was one generation later than Amillarus. He records, "that they say the Musaris Oannes, the fish-deity, the Annedotus, appeared in the time of Amenon:" Alexander Polyhistor, who was treating of the Oannes, not the Annedotus who was "*very like him*," places his ap-

pearance in the first year: the first year of the return of the race of Cain to the valley where Abel was murdered. Nothing can be more clear and intelligible, than this piece of history. But Mr. Bryant, as if purposely to confuse the text, says: "Alexander Polyhistor, who first took this history in hand, mentions that this personage (the Oannes) shewed himself in the first year; but Apollodorus says it was after forty Sari. Abydenus differing from both, makes the second Annedotus appear after twenty-six Sari." Now each of the authors, whom he quotes even according to his own translation agree respecting the Oannes. The two latter were treating of the appearance of the Annedotus, the fish-deity, who was very like the Oannes, evincing that he was not the same. And to elucidate the account, after recording that the Oannes appeared in the first year after the return of this race, for the purpose of instructing them in various sciences, it is added, "he infused into them a knowledge of right and wrong. He instructed them in every thing, which could tend to soften manners and humanize mankind: from that time, so universal were his instructions, that nothing has been added material, by way of improvement." They then proceed to inform us, that, subsequently, a semi-dæmon, or prophet, called the Annedotus, or Musaris Oannes, who was in ap-

pearance very like unto the Oannes, appeared amongst these new comers (the race of Alaporus) and then state that the first appearance of this prophet was during the rule of Amillarus, the son of Alaporus, twenty-six *Σαροι*, or about 260 years, after the appearance of Oannes, among his new subjects. That the second appearance of the Anngdotus, was during the rule of Amenon, fourteen *Σαροι* later, or after the fortieth *Σαρος* had expired. Now the last of these periods answers to about A. M. 808 : and we must be cautious not to mistake the time, or the rule of these princes, for that of their reign. The same author (Berosus) who places the *rule* of Amillarus at twenty-six *Σαροι*, informs us that his *reign* did not commence until after forty-nine *Σαροι*, or about A. M. 957 ; and that of Amenon, who ruled during the forty-first *Σαρος* not until the sixty-third, or about A. M. 1085.

Mr. Bryant next proposes four questions, which may be answered as follows :

“ 1. From what fixed time do they reckon ? ”

Ans. From the return of Cain from the city of Enoch, in the land of Nod, to the valley, where Abel was murdered ; and from the first year of the rule of that race at Chaldea, or Sipora.

“ 2. To what year do they refer ? ”

Ans. The year of the world 413, or when 15 myriads of prophetic years were passed, and the year of the world 474, when the *rule* of this race commenced.

“ 3. Whose were those reflections ? ”

Ans. The reflections of the several authors who wrote, from the works of Berosus, who not only mentioned the appearance of the Oannes, and the Annedotus, but other animals like Oannes, of whom Berosus promises to give an account in his second book, when he treats of the history of the kings ; and which would doubtless have answered to the other Avatars of the Hindus.

“ 4. When did the Oannes appear ? When was the first year ! From when did they reckon time ! ”

Ans. A. M. 413 when this race returned, whose *rule* commenced A. M. 474, and lasted 120 Sari, or 1200 years ; commencing from A. M. 474. For as 1680 prophetic years answer to A. M. 1656, so do 1200 to 1182, and 480 to 474 : and $1200 + 480 = 1680$; and $1182 + 474 = 1656$.

“ Their rule,” says Berosus, “ consisted collectively of one hundred and twenty Sari, *reaching* to the *time* of the *deluge* ” But they returned

after fifteen myriads of years : or sixty-one years sooner*.

The Chaldeans, equally with the Egyptians, make use of the word *dæmon*, to denote that which partakes of the Deity. "In Thebais where the worship of Cnept was introduced, and where they owned no mortal being to be a god, but worshipped the Eternal, under the name of Cnept, who, they insisted, was without beginning and without end, they termed him the good *Dæmon*†." In like manner Berosus terms the first deity the semi-dæmon, or semi-god.

Mr. Bryant objects that "there was no occasion for the appearance of the Annedotus, if such a person as Oannes had gone before him." He seems not to understand the mission of the prophet, who foretold the deluge, nor to recollect, that as Adam was a type of death, so was Enoch a type of the resurrection or life eternal. So that the coming of the Annedotus was rendered necessary, from the Oannes having preceded him. Had not Adam fallen, the prophecies of Enoch had not become necessary. Who was so likely during the first year of the return of the race of Cain, to expostulate

* The rule of the race of Alaporus in the province of Chaldea is stated at 120 *Σαροι*; their reign, as sovereigns, at 74 *Σαροι* only.

† Eusilius.

with them on the abominations they had introduced, as the Oannes, or Adam, the general father of the human race, and the sovereign of the world? Neither is it likely, that a people, represented as naturally fierce, as addicted to every species of vice, and as living without rule or order, would have submitted to the instruction and control of any other human being. And we have seen, that, at the same period of time, the Chinese suppose Fo-hi, the first of men, the son of heaven to have appeared amongst his new subjects, to reform similar abuses. The Annedotus, or Enoch, appeared subsequently; and, according to the Hebrews, this prophet sojourned on earth from A. M. 623 to A. M. 988. Every appearance of the Annedotus was between those periods. For, whether the epoch, from whence Berosus reckoned, was the return, or the commencement, of the rule of the race of Alaporus, makes little difference. If it was the former, the prophet appeared to Amillarus A. M. 673. If it was the latter, the prophet appeared in A. M. 734. For $413 + 260 = 673$; and $474 + 260 = 734$. And the second appearance to Amenon was either in A. M. 813, or A. M. 874. For $413 + 400 = 813$; and $474 + 400 = 874$. Here we have another signal instance of the mercy and goodness of the Almighty. Cain, who went out from the presence of the Lord in consequence of the murder of

Abel, returns in the beginning of the fifth century, with a large proportion of his family, who became civilized ; who improved in every branch of science, but continued stubbornly bent against the worship of the living God. At this epoch the race of Seth, hitherto eminent for their piety, from intermarrying with the apostate race, begin to swerve from the worship of the living God : the prophet therefore appears. He warns mankind in general of their impending danger ; explains to them these divine mysteries, which were beyond mortal comprehension without the assistance of revelation ; and, finally, assures them of the resurrection, and life eternal to be obtained by repentance and a birth unto righteousness. All of which is given at large in the Vedas, supposed to have been written more than 5000 years past ; extracts from which I will transcribe in my next. This incarnate God of the Hindus, as the Annetotus of the Chaldeans, to complete his mission, like the disciples of Christ, travels into every part of the inhabited world. He appears in that province, over which Amillarus the son of Cain presided, in the year of the world 734 : he again appears an hundred and forty years after, in another province, situated on the Eruthrean sea ; over which Amenon the grandson of Cain ruled. This was in the year of the world 874. Here he again

prophecies to the people, and exhorts them to repentance. We learn from Eusebius, that "the whole body of the Musaris Oannes, the Annedotus, was like that of a fish; but under the head of a fish, he had that of a man. Being endowed with superior reason, he instructed men in the true religion, and warned them respecting futurity." This was at the close of the 40th *Sapos* of the rule of the race of Alaporus, and the 88th *Sapos* of the world; or after 880 prophetic years: but the heart of man became hardened, and he increased in wickedness. The Annedotus, therefore, appears again in the province of Dravira, situated south of Carnata, and gives those directions to the pious prince, who ruled over that province, which have been so fully detailed in my first Letter, when treating of the *Matsya* Avatar. That the Sapheri of the Hindus, and the Musaris Oannes of the Chaldeans, were the same, admits of no doubt. The form was the same. The latter had the head of a man, under that of a fish, the former is depicted with the head of a man, issuing out of the mouth of a fish. And Sir William Jones assures us, "that the learned and accurate author of the *Dabistan*, whose information concerning the Hindus is wonderfully correct, mentions an opinion of the pundits, with whom he conversed, that Buddha commenced this career ten years

before the close of the third age ;" or after 890 years were passed ; which, if reduced, answers to A. M. 878, and meets the Chaldean record, proving that the career, mentioned by the learned Hindu was the prophecy of the deluge, which might well be called a glorious career. Heretofore the mission of the prophet had been confined to preaching, and explaining the word of God : he now prophesies of futurity, and warns the world of the impending wrath of an offended God. There is scarcely a country in the world, that has not, more or less, some knowledge of this great prophet of the old world. Suidas names him Nannacus ; others Annacus. But all place the close of his career before the birth of Deucalion. Enoch was translated sixty-nine years before the birth of Noah. These authors relate " that having in vain endeavoured to convert mankind, and turn them from their impious practices, he collected the people in a temple, and, having warned them of futurity, he, before he left them, offered up prayers, accompanied with many tears, for their reformation ; insomuch, that to weep as Enoch, became a proverb ;" which others more correctly write, to weep *for* Enoch became a proverb.

Thus it appears clear, that the Oannes and the Annedotus were two distinct persons ; and that the latter appeared at two different periods, to two

different princes of the same family, but of different generations ; and that such appearances were during the periods that they severally ruled over a maritime province. But Berossus informs us further. He tells us that " there were other animals like Oannes of whom he would give an account, in his second book *, when he came to the history of the kings. Berossus places every appearance of the Annedotus during the third and beginning of the fourth age ; never exceeding the first thousand years of the world. For when he speaks of a subsequent illumination of the Deity, he styles him Odacan. The Hindus usually speak of the fish-deity as the rudder of the ark. The Chaldeans as the pilot to the vessel. At Phalerus he was placed in the stern of the vessel ; by others, on a float. In short, we may trace this divine Spirit in an incarnate form, as Enoch, in every part of the world ; frequently under the title of Dyonyusus, who is sometimes confounded with Deucalion ; probably from their history being

* Animals, or illuminations of the Deity, prophets *like unto* Oannes, or Adam. These were the patriarchs of the antediluvian world, of the race of Seth. In no instance are these illuminations compared to the Annedotus, the Musaris Oannes, who was considered as an incarnation of the Deity. Wherefore coming after the Oannes, and assuming a mortal form, he is said, in *appearance* to have been *very like* Oannes.

originally taken from hieroglyphics misunderstood. Every hieroglyphical representation of the deluge describes the prophet as the preserving spirit, at the stern of the ship, in which the patriarch was preserved. So that, in after times, those ceremonies which were intended exclusively for Dyonusus, or Enoch, were by some consecrated to Deucalion, or Noah: according to the Grecian mythology, Deucalion was the son of Prometheus; and Prometheus is one of the characters under which Enoch is described in mythology. For although fabulously represented as a great artist, by whom men were formed anew, yet Minerva co-operates with him, in making those images, and "inspiring them with a *living soul*. He raised altars to the true God, and gave the first directions relative to building a ship." Noah was the descendant of Enoch in a direct line. From the same mythology, we learn that Dyonusus was twice born: some relate thrice. This appears to the prophet, as the Hindu Buddha, both in a spiritual and temporal sense. In the former sense, as the founder of baptismal rites, the second birth, the birth unto righteousness, received from the divine mother the Gayita; and, in the latter sense, the followers of Vishnu represent him as having become regenerate in the postdiluvian world, when

he appeared as the son of Devasi in the character of ~~Christ~~ ^{Christ}.

To return from this digression to Babylon; where, we are informed, "was in those times a great resort of people of various nations, who inhabited Chaldea, and lived without rule and order like the beasts of the field: in the *first* year there made its appearance from the Eruthrean sea, an animal endowed with reason, who was called Oannes." "Oannes," says Mr. Bryant, "was certainly the emblematic character of *Noah* or *Sisuthrus*. He is said to have shewn himself in the first year, which is an imperfect, but intelligible piece of history. The first year mentioned in this manner absolute, must signify the first year in time, the year of the renewal of the world. He appeared twice, and discoursed much with mankind, but would not eat with them. This I imagine was in the antediluvian state, when there is reason to suppose that men in general fed upon raw flesh, nay, eat it crude while the life was in it." These arguments are as contradictory as the quotation is unfaithful. But supposing it otherwise; if the first appearance of the Oannes was the first year of the renewal of the world after the deluge, it could not have been in the antediluvian world. And if the first year, being absolute, was the first year of Noah's reign in the new world, from

whence came the great resort of people from various nations, who in those times ~~lived~~ without rule and order, with whom the Gannes conversed much, but would not eat? The first year after the deluge, the whole world was as a vast unpeopled waste, totally bereft of inhabitants, save those who issued from the ark. Besides, if this author is correct in supposing that men in general fed on raw flesh, there is no reason for supposing that Noah had an antipathy thereto. But the command of God to refrain from flesh "with the life thereof which is the blood thereof" appears to be a prohibition of that barbarous custom still prevalent in Egypt, of cutting up animals, while the life was in them; a practice, shame it is to say, the finny tribe are still victims to in our own country; and to prevent which, a merciful God, when he ordained that the animal creation should be food for man, commanded that he should refrain from the blood which was the life thereof. This command is yet more comprehensive, as appears from the succeeding verse. It is not only a prohibition of inhumanity, but of human sacrifices in particular, and of the unnecessary shedding of blood in general; which had been practised by the priests in the sacrifice of cattle. And in this sense the Hindus understand it. "Thou condemnest, O kind-hearted, the whole Veda when

“thou perceivest the slaughter of cattle presented for sacrifice.” But Berosus could not allude to this command of the Almighty, which was not renewed in the person of Noah, for more than twelve hundred years after the appearance of Oannes. Berosus recorded that the Oannes conversed much with mankind, but would not eat with them, to denote that he was not of the idolatrous race of Cain. For it is well known, even to the present day, that no man of a superior cast can eat with an inferior, not in point of rank, but of sanctity. Therefore, the Oannes, who appeared for the reformation of the race of Alaparus, was in the habit of retiring each evening, after instructing his new subjects. That the Oannes was not Noah, I trust you are now fully convinced. We are next told by the same author, that the four double-faced persons, who appeared in the time of Daus, called Enedocus, Eneugamus, Enabarbus, and Anemantus, “were certainly the three sons of Noah, who had, like their father, been witnesses of the antediluvian world.” He then endeavours to explain that Daus, the *shepherd*, in whose time those four persons are said to have appeared, was no other than Nimrod. “For the original list, supposed to have been a dynasty of antediluvian kings, was the genealogy of Nimrod, the first king of the country, in which were con-

tained four persons only. First Sisuthrus, or the patriarch; next, under the character of Amemon, Amelon; Amillarus is Ham; Eudoreschus (Euc-ud-Arez-chus) is the son of Cush; and, lastly, Alorus and Duonus, the shepherd, was Nimrod. For it is expressly said of him, that he took the title of Shepherd. The rest are foreign to the catalogue, and through *ignorance* have been inserted." Now, it is certain, Berosus places Daus, the shepherd, five reigns after Alorus; and the commencement of his reign 381 years after the death of that prince (Vide Tables XIX and XXII). But, admitting Daus, the commencement of whose reign, Berosus expressly says, was just 275 years (28 Σαροι, or 280 prophetic years) before the deluge, to have been intended for Nimrod,* whose reign is said to have commenced 304 years after the deluge, how does it assist the argument which it is brought forward to support? Nimrod commenced his reign on the death of his father Cush, about A. M. 1960, who had succeeded to the government about 55 years before, on the death of Ham: so that, if these four personages, who appeared in the time of Nimrod, were Noah and his sons, the old patriarch must have made his appearance in the 860th year of his age, with his three sons (one of whom the grandfather of Nimrod had been dead for more

than 50 years) to congratulate his great grandson Nimrod, on having seized on a country, which by right belonged to his elder brother.

Mr. Bryant next refers us to the account given by Alexander Polyhistor, as follows: "Berosus, in his first book concerning the history of Babylon, informs us that he lived in the time of Alexander the son of Philip; and he mentions that there were written accounts preserved, at Babylon, with the greatest care, comprehending a term of fifteen myriads of years. These writings contained a history of the heavens, and of the sea; of the birth of mankind; also of those who had *sovereign rule*; and of the actions achieved by them. And, in the first place, he describes Babylonia as a country, which lay between the Tigris and Euphrates; he mentions that it abounded with wheat, barley, Ocrus, Sesamum, and in the lakes were found the roots called Yongoe, which were good to be eaten, and were in respect to nutriment like barley; there were also palm-trees, and apples, and most kinds of fruits; fish too, and birds, both those that are merely of flight, and those that take to the element of water. The part of Babylon that bordered on Arabia was barren and without water; but that, which lay on the other side, had hills, and was fruitful. At Babylonia there was in these times a *great resort of people of various*

nations, who inhabited Chaldea, and lived without rule and order, like the beasts of the field; in the first year there made its appearance, from a part of the Erythrean sea, which bordered upon Babylonia, an animal endowed with reason, who was called Oannes." The account goes on to give the cosmogony of the world, and the reigns of the kings; making the collective rule of this people, from the first year to the time of the deluge, one hundred and twenty *Σαροι* or four hundred and thirty-two thousand years of days; answering to twelve hundred years. The above Mr. Bryant assures us "is a faithful translation," clearly demonstrating that Oannes the man of the sea, was the emblematic character of Noah: "for the new world must be considered as the basis of historic knowledge." Let us examine this extract, considering it as the history of the time, not when Berosus wrote, but of which Berosus wrote; commencing with the return of the race of Cain to Babylon, A. M. 413, and with the commencement of their rule as governors of provinces, A. M. 474: the priest of Belus begins, by telling us that when he wrote, there were *written* accounts preserved with the greatest care, from fifteen myriads of years. Fifteen myriads of Chaldean historic years are equal to four hundred and sixteen prophetic years and a fraction: for $150000 \div 360 =$

416½. We can scarcely suppose that Berosus would have made a boast of finding records *for* 416 years, when his contemporary Calisthenes, who accompanied Alexander to Babylon, traced the improved astronomical observations 1490 years further back, or 1903 years from the same period. This author, doubtless, wrote that "there were written accounts preserved at Babylon, with the greatest care *from*, not *for*, fifteen myriads of years." For in another part he tells us, that before the deluge, the deity appeared to Sisuthrus, and enjoined him to commit to writing a history of the beginning, procedure, and final conclusion of all things *to* that time, and to bury these accounts securely in the temple of the Sun at Sipora. That, after the waters were abated, they returned by a circuitous road to Babylon, and recovered the writings, which had been buried at Sipora, and which contained a history of the world, from the first fifteen myriads of years;" or A. M. 413, when the race of Cain returned. From these records Berosus wrote. Whereas Mr. Bryant would infer, that his history commenced only 416 years from the time that Berosus wrote; fixing the period for the commencement of his history at about 3200 years after the deluge. In my first letter, I explained that Cicero, in like manner, *intended*,

the year of the world 481 by 437000 years.* Nothing can be more clear than the account as given by these authors. They first inform us, that the rule of the Cainites began 1200 prophetic years before the deluge. For their rule, which consisted collectively of twelve hundred years, *reached to the deluge*. And they then proceed to say, that they had preserved written documents from the period of their return, or when four hundred and sixteen prophetic years were passed. Berosus was writing the history of the race who had sovereign rule over Chaldea or Sipora, and of the actions achieved by their kings. He therefore commences his history from fifteen myriads of years (days) from the creation; which was the epoch, when the race of Alaparus the son of Alorus returned to Sipora. To proceed: the Oannes is said to have appeared in the first year. "In these times there was at Babylon a great resort of people of various nations." Whether we understand "the first year," according to the general acceptation, as the first year of the world, A. M. 1, or according to Mr. Bryant, as the first year of the renewal of time, the year after the deluge A. M. 1657, it is equally incongruous. For in neither instance could a great number of persons

* Vide page 50.

of various nations have been assembled. The first year, as given by Berosus is a plain and intelligent piece of history. Having previously stated that the race, which on the death of Adam succeeded to the sovereignty of the world, returned to the land of Chaldea A. M. 413, he proceeds to state, that in consequence thereof, "there was a great resort of people of *various* nations, who inhabited Chaldea," which had until then been the residence of the race of Seth only. "These *new* comers lived together without rule or order, like the beasts of the field." In consequence of which in the *first year* after their return, the Oannes, the first Hindu Buddha or prophet, the first-created, appeared among "his *new* subjects," in a hope to reclaim them from those unclean practices which they had brought with them from the east of Eden. "The Oannes conversed much with this race; he instructed them respecting religion, and all kinds of moral duties; he civilized their manners, but he would not eat with them." The latter remark could only be introduced to prove the different race from whence they sprang. The Oannes, the priest and father of his people, the great progenitor of the children of the Sun, as a priest or Brahman, could not eat with the descendants of Cain, that being an abomination even to the present day. The distinction of cast has been

observed from the very earliest times in the new world, and the Brahmins profess that it was the same in the old. In the 43d chapter of Genesis, verse 32, we read, that "they set on for Joseph by himself, and for his brethren by themselves; and for the Egyptians which did eat with him by themselves; because the Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews, for that is an abomination unto the Egyptians." And this, we know, was the case not only in Egypt but Chaldea and every part of Hindostan. This extract from Alexander Polyhistor, therefore, so far from invalidating the accounts given by Abydenus and Apollodorus, confirms what those authors relate. And it is observable, that the trifling alteration of reading days for years, a system followed by the prophets in our own sacred writings,* reconciles the whole Chaldean record with the Hebrew text of our Scripture. Mr. Bryant attempts to parry these evident truths, by asserting, "Berosus never wrote that the rule of the Chaldean kings reached to the time of the deluge; they are the words of the copier; for Alorus was indubitably Nimrod, and those ten, supposed to have been antediluvian kings, were the genealogy of Nimrod, consisting of four persons only." Does this author mean,

* Ezek. iv. 4, 5. Numb. xiv. 34.

that four reigns only occupied twelve hundred years at any given period after the deluge? Or that the reign of Nimrod reached down to ~~A.M.~~ 2838? Had the Greeks omitted these words, the text would have been equally clear. For the events which they record are to be found in no other period of history, sacred or profane. But how does this system agree with the comment of Mr. Bryant in a preceding page, where he censures Apollodorus for having omitted Otiartes, whom he styles the ninth in the genealogy of Noah! "There seems," says he, "some omission in the transcript, given by Eusebius from Apollodorus, which is supplied by Syncellus; he mentions Amempsinus as eighth king, in order, who reigned ten Sari; after him comes Otiartes, to whom he allots eight Sari. His son was Xisusthrus, in whose time was the well-known deluge." If this author believed that the genealogy was that of Nimrod, and consisted of four persons only, "the rest being foreign to the catalogue, and through ignorance inserted," what motive could induce him to enforce the introduction of Amempsinus and Otiartes? For if Xisusthrus was Noah, and the son of Otiartes, then must all the preceding have been antediluvian kings; which militates entirely against the *inverted* system that he is so anxious to establish. The Chaldeans name the

father of Xisuthrus or Sisuthrus, which is the same, Ardates. We can scarcely suppose that Mr. Bryant follows Syncellus, for the purpose of establishing that mankind were preserved in the race of Cain; which must be the case, if Sisuthrus was the son of Otiartes. It was the history of the kings, not of the patriarchs, that Berosus promised to give an account of in his second book. As this, unfortunately, has not been preserved, we must be satisfied with the information which we find in the first, where it is recorded, that of the ten generations of antediluvian princes, seven only, inclusive of Alorus, became sovereigns before the flood; and where their names and the number of years each prince in the line of Alaparus reigned from the death of Alorus to the deluge are specified. And after telling us that those six reigns collectively occupied seventy-four *Σαροι*, or 740 years, and reached to the deluge, Alexander Polyhistor further informs us, "that after the death of Ardates, his son Sisuthrus succeeded, and reigned eighteen *Σαροι*; in his time was the well-known deluge." Now, as Ardates was not of the race of Alaparus, Sisuthrus the son of Ardates must have been of the race of Seth. Berosus wrote of the kings who governed the antediluvian world; and the Chaldeans, equally with the Hebrew, Chinese, Egyptian, and Hindu historians, repre-

sent all the kings except one who governed the world, from the death of the first-created to the deluge, as the descendants of the eldest son of our first parent; thus admitting the eighth prince, who was saved in the ark, to have descended from a younger son; and clearly evincing, that, if the eighteen Σαροι noticed by Alexander Polyhistor, were intended for the reign of Sisuthrus, they could not have been in the antediluvian world. But here, I conceive, we have an error of the translator; who, reading in Berosus, that "the prince during whose reign happened the great deluge, reigned eighteen Σαροι," and in another part, that during the *time* of Sisuthrus, the son of Ardates, happened the great deluge, attached the eighteen Σαροι as the reign of the latter; not recollecting that Anodaphus, who reigned that number of years, and whose reign reached to the deluge, although the contemporary of Sisuthrus, was not of the same rank at the same time with him. Anodaphus was the seventh and last king of the old world; Sisuthrus the eighth and first king of the new world. How, says Mr. Bryant, "could the ancients be so weak as to imagine, that there was a city in Babylon, and a country named from it, ten generations before the flood, also a province styled Chaldea? These names were circumstantial and imposed in after times, for particular reasons,

which could not before have existed. Babylon was the Babel of Scripture, so named from the confusion of tongues. In like manner Chaldea was denominated from people named Chusdim or Chassdim." The first assertion is founded on very high authority, but we have the same authority for saying that when the city of Babylon was first built the whole world was "of one language, and of one speech." Consequently, unless the Hebrew was that one language, neither the city nor the tower, could have been *then* named from the word confusion: Although it might subsequently have been so called, by the Hebrews, but not by the Chaldeans. On or about the time that Peleg was born, Noah divided the world between his three sons. Ham and Japheth travelled westward. They departed from their father Noah, to inhabit those countries which the Almighty had appointed for them. They stopt at a plain in the land of Shinar, and disregarding the orders which they had received to separate, they determined to build a city and a tower, which employed them for twenty-four years: when they left off building the city, all the workmen being necessary for the completion of the tower. By this time, the population being greatly increased, they set about enlarging the city. For on that work they were employed, when they were scattered from thence, over the

face of the earth *. When this people *first* parted from Noah, Babylon contained two-thirds of the population of the world ; probably amounting, including women and children, to about 4600 persons ; of whom 948 males might have attained the age of 20 years. These persons, most probably, called the country by that name which Japheth and Ham had known it by, in the old world. The argument, therefore, veers from the point to which it was directed. For, as this author admits, that the account, given by Berosus, goes so far back as “ the first year of time, which was the first year after the flood ;” this being 140 years before the languages were confounded, the word Babel militates just as much against the 140 years of the new world, as the 1656 of the old. But after all, Berosus never informs us, that the country was called Chaldea, or the city Babylon. He tells us, that “ when the Deity warned Sisuthrus to retire with his family into the ark, that he directed him to bury all the sacred records in a temple in the city of the Sun at Sipora (thence called the City of Books) that after the ark had rested on one of the Corcyrean mountains in Armenia, the Chaldeans (those persons by whom Sipora was re-peopled after the deluge) taking a

* Gen. xi. 8.

circuitous route, journeyed towards Babylonia ; and having found the records, which contained the account of the beginning, procedure, and final conclusion of all things from the creation to the deluge, they set about building cities, erecting temples, and Babylon was thus inhabited *again*." Now, as the records were deposited in a temple at Sipora, before the deluge, and found immediately after it, in a temple in that city, which, in after times, was named Babylon, it is clear, that Berosus supposed Sipora to be the antediluvian name of Babylon. The Hindus, and Egyptians, name the city which they suppose the seat of regal state before the deluge, Casi, or the Splendid. And it is highly probable that the two sons of Noah, Ham, and Japheth, who had lived an hundred years in the antediluvian world, should have directed their course towards that city, which had formerly been the capital of the world, and where they probably found many ancient temples and palaces still remaining. It is sufficient for our purpose, that Berosus meant to say that the city, which in his time was named Babylon; was that city formerly named Sipora ; in which the records of the old world had been preserved. And then it would be just as rational to assert, that Ham never settled at Babylon, because the city where the tower of Babel was built was situated east of

the Euphrates, forty miles distant from the site of the city subsequently built by Seleucus, on the west of the Tigris, called Seleucia Babylonica, afterwards Babylonia, and at length Babylon, as it is to infer, that Berosus was not treating of the antediluvian world, because he described the city which the Chaldeans supposed the capital of the antediluvian world, by the name which it bore in after times, and by which alone it could have been recognized when he wrote. The names of the antediluvian patriarchs were equally circumstantial with that of Babel, and equally, "imposed in after times for particular reasons." Would Mr. Bryant infer that the ten patriarchs did not exist before the flood, because the names assigned to them in the Hebrew Scripture were circumstantial, and drawn from that language? He does not openly avow such belief. Yet we learn his sentiment by implication; which is perfectly in unison with the assertion, that Babylon did not exist before the deluge, because the name assigned to it in after times by the Hebrews was derived from Babel, which denotes confusion. That name most certainly was not given to the capital of the Parthian kingdom, to denote the confusion of tongues at the commencement of the new world. If "our Scripture version idly follows that of the Greeks and Romans, in rendering that which should be

Chasdim or Chusdim one of the sons of Noah, Chaldeus," the Greeks and Romans, as idly followed the Chaldeans, and Hindus, who name the country after Chusha* of the sixth generation in the Solar line; after whom the whole of that side of the country was called Cushadweep, at the same time that the rest of the world was called Bhāratta, from the great chief of that name of the same generation in the race of Cain, or the Moon, and who became the sovereign of the whole world. And it is at least as probable that Chaldea was derived from Chusha, the son of Dasaratha, the Mahalaleel of the Hebrews, as that it was derived from Cush the son of Ham. More especially, as about 250 years after the deluge, we find the latter, who had previously settled in the south-east, near the land of Canaan, bringing a colony with him from his own country, and settling south of Babylon, in a country called Chaduca, but formerly Chusca. Now it is well established that the provinces seized on by Cush, were those originally destined to Shem. We cannot, therefore, suppose that the name formerly given to that country, before it was conquered by Cush, was called after him. It is clear then, that the race of Shem designated the province by the name by which it

* Vide Letter II.

was known in the old world. If, says Mr. Bryant, "Babylon survived, one would imagine that other cities would have been in like manner preserved, and that the temples, if any had been in the world before, would have remained, as well as that at Sipora; whence it would naturally appear unnecessary for these few people to have been in such a hurry to build." On what authority is it asserted that other cities and temples did not remain, that the family of Noah at that time consisted of a few persons only, or that they were in a hurry to build?

First, every eastern nation believes that the more noble buildings of the antediluvian world were not destroyed, and many choultries and temples still extant, being excavations of the solid rock could neither be injured by time nor climate, and are just as likely to have been the works of artists of the old world, as of those of the early ages of the new world. Of these Mavaliporam may be considered one. The Mosaic account does not, in express words, inform us that these buildings remained; but it is surely implied. The dove returned no more, when she found food and shelter without the ark: can we believe that the Almighty, who, during twelve months, preserved the grass of the field, and the trees of the forest, for the food and shelter of the animal creation,

was unmindful of man alone; commanding him from the ark to a world, where no habitation remained; where he was exposed to the searching rays of a burning Sun, and the inclemency of tropical rains? Was the olive-branch miraculous, or did the olive-tree remain? If the slender olive braved the storm, the gigantic buildings cemented with bitumen could not have been in much danger.

Secondly, if, according to Mr. Bryant, Babylon was the *first* built city in the *world*, as one hundred years had elapsed from the deluge to the period when Ham and Japheth left Noah, and journeyed to the plain of Shinar, they could not have been in a very great *hurry* to build; and the *few people* exposed without shelter for more than an hundred years must have amounted, on a very moderate computation, when this author supposes Babylon to have been first built, to near 7000 persons*. Of these two-thirds, or about 4600 migrated to Babylon. Now, according to the dimensions of the tower of Babel, it would have taken about 3000 workmen, including women and under labourers, to complete it in 40 years. So that, unless we wish, with our author, to set the whole Mosaic account at defiance, we must dis-

* Bedford's calculation.

believe every thing he has written on the subject. If the tower of Babylon was the first effort towards masonry in the postdiluvian world, it must have been brought to great perfection in the old ; which militates entirely against the hypothesis of the temples notwithstanding a rain of forty days. Here our author is not satisfied with allotting 100 years as probationary time : for he insists that " it is certain that Nimrod built Babel, which is Babylon, after the flood " (the reign of Nimrod commenced 303 years after the flood ;) forgetting that a few pages before, when the existence of Babylon militated against the first Titanian war being antediluvian, he had quoted a passage from Diodorus Siculus to prove that " when Ninus, or the Ninevite, invaded Assyria, it was not against the city of Babylon ; for that was not then in being ; " adding from himself, " It is very truly said, for the city Babel had been begun, but was at that time deserted, and left unfinished ; they left off to build the city. It seems to have been under a curse, and we hear nothing more of it for ages. Not a word occurs about Babylon, or Babylonia, till the time of Berodach, Baladan, and of Nebuchadnezzar, who came after him ; when this city was rebuilt." From the above we may estimate the degree of credit due to this author. First he tells us, that Babylon was the first built city in the world ;

“ that it is certain that it was built by Nimrod.” The dimensions of Babylon were as follows : the walls were in thickness 87 feet, in height 370 feet, and in length 480 furlongs. And it is recorded that when Nimrod subsequently built Nineveh, it was exactly on the same plan, in the form of a square, of the same dimensions : although the height and width of the walls multiplied into each other, did not amount to more than one-tenth of the walls of Babylon. And then to establish the hypothesis that the Titanian war was postdiluvian, Mr. Bryant as confidently asserts that, from the time they left off to build the city of Babylon, which according to Scripture was only 140 years after the deluge, or A. M. 1797, Babylon was never heard of, until about 600 years before Christ, when it was rebuilt by Nebuchodonozor ; adding, in fact “ the account given by Berosus is of so early a date, as to be almost coeval with the annals of the new world, and must be looked upon as the basis of historic knowledge. The supposed antediluvian accounts are trifling ; the former world is far separated from us. It is like a vast peninsula joined to the continent by a strip of land, which hardly admits of any connection : he must have been wise, indeed, after an interval of so many thousand years, to have known that Babylon originally bore sesamum and dates.” The old world

ended in the autumn of A. M. 1656 ; the new world commenced at the same season of A. M. 1657 ; consequently, if the account given by Berosus is of so " early a date as to be almost coeval with the annals of the new world, the *first* year being the *first* year of *renewal* of time, the first year after the deluge," he might have stepped one year further back, and gathered a date, as well as an apple, without much danger of falling from the little strip of land : even had the antediluvian records from which he copied, neither been buried at Sipora, or taken into the ark by Noah. For as Ham resided on that vast peninsula for an hundred years, and was ninety years of age, when his grandfather Lamech died, who lived fifty-six years during the time of Adain, Berosus, who was a priest of Belus, had an opportunity, even if writing was unknown before the flood, of examining the records left by Ham, the first founder of Babylon ; who received the accounts from his grandfather Lamech, as they were related to him by the great father of mankind, Adam. But the philosopher Callisthenes informs us, that he had found *written* and *regular* astronomical observations at Babylon carried back so far as A. M. 1776 ; which renders it highly probable, that Berosus should have found historic ones. To this Mr. Bryant objects, that neither Noah nor his descend-

ants, for at least 737^{years,}_A were enabled to record any transactions, they being totally ignorant of letters. This he elucidates as follows: "it is said that Oannes, or Sisuthrus, who is Noah, instructed men in the knowledge of letters, and committed many things to writing. For my part, I believe there was no writing antecedent to the law of Mount Sinai: here the divine art was promulgated." Which is as much as to say, that the Almighty appeared to Moses for the purpose of promulgating *that law*, by which mankind was to be guided in this world and judged in the next, in a mode which it was utterly impossible for them to comprehend. Such may have been the practice of wily priests in the dark ages of superstition, but it is incompatible with the character of a just and merciful God. But the Pentateuch informs us, that the commands were issued from the mouth of God. "God spake these words, and said*," can admit of but one interpretation. It is true, in a subsequent chapter, it is recorded, "that the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables†." But this is a figurative expression, as we frequently say on an unexpected event, the hand of God was perceptible therein. Had these tables been of

* Exod. vi. 20.

† Exod. xxxii. 16.

divine workmanship, would Moses have presumed to have dashed them beneath his feet? "And Moses' anger waxed hot, and he cast the tables out of his hands, and brake them beneath the mount*." This passage is fully explained. For in chap. iv. ver. 4. it is expressly said, that "Moses wrote all the words which the Lord had spoken." Again, "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write *thou* these words; and he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread nor drink water; and *he* wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments†." But writing was not confined to the few, nor to the learned. It was general among all the tribes. For Moses, with the elders of Israel, commanded the people to set up great stones and plaster them with plaster; and when they had passed over Jordan, the people were directed to *write* the law thereon; "And thou shalt write upon them all the words of this law‡." They were likewise commanded, "every man to write them upon the door-posts of their house, and upon the gates§." Now every word of this must be false, if writing was a divine art, first promulgated when the tables were delivered to Moses. But of this we may be assured,

* Exod. xxxii. 19.

† Exod. xxxiv. 27, 28.

‡ Deut. xxvii. 3.

§ Deut. xi. 20.

that the law was promulgated in that mode which was the most easily comprehended by the people, for whose instruction it was ordained : and then, whether the law was delivered in writing; according to this author, or whether, according to the Scripture, Moses wrote those commands which the Almighty dictated, it is equally certain, that writing was an art in general use. To suppose otherwise, is not only to impeach the justice of the Almighty, but to rest the history of the world, for the first two thousand five hundred years, on the doubtful authority of hieroglyphics. In which case, if this author is correct in asserting "that the invention of hieroglyphics was certainly a discovery of the Chaldeans," then were the Chaldeans the most likely people in the world to have had correct accounts relative to the antediluvian world; more especially as he admits, that "the Chaldeans had as much learning as could arise from hieroglyphical representations: they might," he adds, "have had a knowledge of lines, by which geometrical problems must be illustrated; and the use of figures, for numeration: but were without letters for ages. In fine had they been possessed of letters, they would never have descended to symbols." The former is universally admitted; but the latter is an inverted argument. That they were in possession of lines and figures is proved

beyond the possibility of doubt ; first, from their astronomical observations ; and, secondly, from their chronology. For, although events might have been described by emblems, dates never could have been so handed down : and the exact coincidence of the Chaldean dates with those of the Hebrews, and Hindus, proves that all are true, or all false. But to contend that they ~~were~~ were without letters, because, had they been in possession of them, they would not have descended to symbols, is as absurd as unfounded." The whole earth was of one language and of one speech * for nearly 1800 years ; during which period no mode could have been adopted so facile and comprehensive, for the purpose of recording events, communicating sentiments, and carrying on trade, or barter, as that of letters. But from the moment that diverse languages were ordained, and men became divided into nations, " every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations †," then did letters become useless for the purpose of communication out of their respective families. Symbols were therefore resorted to ; which appear to have been of two descriptions, hieroglyphics and lines. The former were adopted by the descendants of Ham, and the latter by those of Japheth.

* Gen. xi. 1.

† Gen. x. 5.

At least we know that those nations, which were formed by the former, adopted hieroglyphics, and that lines were carried into China, where they are still in use. They consisted of eight figures, each composed of three lines, partly entire and partly broken; in all producing eight different combinations, which multiplied by itself produces sixty-four different figures, which by being differently disposed, express, in a rude manner, the nature and property of every being, their motion, their rest, their respective opposition, &c. The Chinese affirm that these symbols were invented by Fo-hi, the first of men, the son of heaven. The I-king, the first canonical book of the first order, is written therein*: and, as the Chinese admit that it was not until the time of Confucius, that this book was fully deciphered, and as they record that a prince who lived 1800 years after Fo-hi, by the changes which he made in these lines, gave an account of the reciprocal transmutations of the eight original figures, we may suppose, that the prince who reigned 1800 years after Fo-hi, was the person who first ruled in China; that being the year in which Yu, the first emperor of China, commenced his reign: this was very shortly after the general

* Some authors suppose the revelations of Enoch to have been recorded in these lines.

confusion of tongues at Babel. It is true, European missionaries following their own calculations, place the reign of this prince a thousand and fifty-six years later ; reckoning from the birth of Noah, which they consider the reign of Fo-hi ; they thereby ascribe the changes, which the first emperor Yu made in the lines, to Chew, the tyrant of the second dynasty. But aware that such a discovery militated against the character of that prince, they qualify the assertion by ascribing them to an emperor named *Ven-vang*, and his son *Chew-kong*, who lived at the same period. But neither *Ven-vang*, nor this son, ever became emperors. The former was only a tributary prince ; although the repeated cruelties and oppressions of the emperor Chew provoking a general revolt among his subjects, they entreated *Vu-vang* the son of *Ven-vang*, to put himself at the head of the army ; by which means the tyrant was dethroned, and *Vu* succeeded to the imperial throne. But as a circumstance so material as the first effort towards the extension of the eight figures, by the different changes and transmutations is not mentioned in the life of *Ven-vang*, who lived during the time of the second imperial house, and as Confucius, who is certainly the best Chinese authority extant, admits “ that although

he could relate as mere lessons of morality the events of the first and second imperial houses, yet for want of evidence *he* could give no certain account of them ;” and as the events of the third dynasty are rendered very doubtful, from the circumstance of the historic books having been all destroyed by the order of the second emperor of the fourth dynasty, about 240 years before the Christian era, it becomes a fair inference, that the prince, who began his reign 1800 years after the commencement of the Chou of Fo-hi, or creation of Adam, was that descendant from Noah, who was chosen as chief of those persons who migrated from Babylonia to China. And it is observable, that the Japanese, by the use of symbols, continue to carry on, not only correspondence, but trade, with provinces, the inhabitants of which, were they to meet, would not be able to converse, from a total ignorance of the language of each other. A convincing proof, that a knowledge of letters does not necessarily militate against the use of symbols. The dispersion from Babylon was the only period of time, when they could have been introduced with advantage. An unlettered mariner, shipwrecked on a desert coast, would have no other mode of recording his misfortune, than by portraying, on the rock, the figure of a ship in distress, bulged

and split. The action would arise from a natural impulse, and the memento be understood by every nation that might after arrive. Whereas, had this mariner been better educated, and written the history of his misfortunes in characters unknown to the next persons who arrived on the coast, probably those written characters had been the origin of divers absurd conjectures. Had the mariner been an Hindu, they had inferred (not being able to read the account) that the coast had formerly been inhabited by Indians; since Malabar or Gentoo characters had been traced on the rocks. Whereas an hieroglyphic denoted, to every nation, that a brother sailor had perished from shipwreck.

The inhabitants of Chaldea, at the awful moment when they were visited by the anger of the Almighty, were as the shipwrecked mariner. They were in their own land, but as strangers to each other. And it was the natural impulse of each nation to leave in hieroglyphics a memento of the past. But it does not follow therefrom that they rejected letters. Hieroglyphics were intended as a memento to the end of time, a record that should be understood by every nation of the world. Whilst written characters, only understood by their own nation, were confined for a time, to the recording of events in their several

countries. Accordingly Sanchoniatho gives the history of the old world, from the creation to the time of the great grandson of Noah, as he found it recorded by Thoth, and placed in the archives of Berytus by Mizraim, in the language of the Egyptians. In like manner Berosus, who was a native of Babylon, gives the account of the creation, &c. from the return of the race of Cain to the deluge, as he found it recorded by Ham, and preserved in the temple of Belus in the language of the Chaldeans. In India we find the history of the world from the Antara (time) of Swayambhuva, or the Lotos creation, to the deluge, given in Sanscrit, the original language of that country : clearly evincing that although hieroglyphics were invented as a kind of general language, when the confusion of tongues took place at Babylon, yet that each nation recorded the transactions of their ancestors, in the tongue that they took with them to the country, to which they retired at the period, when new nations were formed. The nations who were in possession of lines, for the purpose of elucidating geometrical problems, and of figures for numeration, would have found no great difficulty in forming an alphabet therefrom. That they were in "want of such materials as were necessary for expedition and free writing," is also an un-

founded assertion. "The rind, and leaves, of trees, and shells, from the sea," adds this author, "can lend but small assistance towards literature; and stones and slabs are not calculated to promote it much better. Epigenes said that the Babylonians, who were great observers of the heavens, had accounts of these observations for 720 years, written upon plinths, baked in the Sun. I can see no proofs, from thence, of the eternity of letters, for which Pliny contends; nor do I believe that letters existed among them at the time." It is well known by every European who has visited India, that the *Cadyan*, on which all Hindu records are kept to the present day, are formed from the leaf of that tree, which Sanchoniatho mentions as being in use in the time of Usues, in the sixth generation from Adam in the race of Cain: which is about the period when, according to *Berosus*, the history of the world was first committed to writing. As Usues was the first that noted these leaves, so was his son Chryser the first artisan in iron. And the *Cadyan* can only be written on with an iron pen. So that, from the commencement of the rule of Cain, no want of materials necessary for expeditious and free writings existed. Had the *Cadyan* been inadequate to the purposes of literature, it had been rejected by the oriental

Musulmen, and, for the purpose of business, by the Europeans. Whereas both know that it is not only the most facile, but the most expeditious mode of carrying on business, in the several Cutchires. I cannot discover any thing contrary to reason in the account quoted by Epigenes, or in the comment thereon by Pliny, if the *m*, or mille, is prefixed to the other numbers. And this letter is obviously omitted by Mr. Bryant, for the purpose of adding—"It is impossible for people to receive any great benefit from letters when they are obliged to go to a shard, or an oyster-shell, for information." As to the high antiquity assigned by Pliny, it is impossible to give any credence to that author, who from 720 years infers eternity, and speaks of those terms as synonymous." Now, reckoning the *MDCCXX* years, from the same period with the 437000 years mentioned by Cicero, or A. M. 1776, the period is carried back to the fifty-sixth year of the creation; which Pliny might very well consider as the beginning of time, and represent as synonymous with eternity. The leaf of the tree, on which the Indians write, does not become a plinth, or Cadyan, until baked and dried in the Sun. Therefore the expression "*Cactilibus latereatis*," is particularly applicable thereto. The leaf of a tree cut into an oblong square, and baked

in the Sun, for the purpose of recording a list, or roll, of astronomical observations, is well explained by "*observationes siderum coctilibus lateratis:*" and, as it appears from Sanchoniatho that the leaves of this tree were known two generations before plinths, or tiles, according to their general acceptation, were known, it follows, that "it *was* possible for people to receive great benefit from letters, although they were obliged to go to a shard, or the leaf of a tree, for information." From writing upon leaves and shells, Mr. Bryant admits, came the terms "*Petalismus* and *Ostracismus*," among the Greeks; and from the bark of trees came *Libri* of the Latins. Those Asiatic authors, who flourished when literature was confined to such materials, never, when properly understood, exceed the bounds of probability. Their numbers are given in a cypher, which enables them to record the month, nay even the day, or hour, on which an event occurred, however far removed. The prophet Daniel denotes 1260 years, by "*a time, times, and half a time:*" because 42 months of 30 days, or a year, years, and an half year, produce that number; for $360 + 720 + 180 = 1260$; which is far more complicated than the Chaldean cypher, which by 120 *Σαροι* denotes 432000 days, or 1200 years.

Having endeavoured to refute those arguments, which you will find at large in the fourth volume of Bryant's Chronology, page 121, I shall conclude this Letter, and in my next furnish you with some extracts from the Vedas, in support of my former assertions.

I remain, with regard,

* * * * *

END OF VOL. I.

ERRATA. VOL. I.

Page	Line	FOR	READ
5.	21	Letter I.	obselete
	2	in Note	Sastra
	3		Sastra
	5	reverted	revealed
8	2	Letter	Lingum
10	2	creature	creative
	9	Patama Rama	Parasa Rama
14	19	864900	8640000
15	1	in 8640000	or 8640000
16	8	in Table II.	Tritajagan
18	2	Letter	432000 x 17
20	1	of 432000 years	or 4320000 x 71
21	Table IV.	x	+
22	23	Letter	Vishna
24	21	Mena	Menn
	27	of time	of a time
27	13	Maha A Menwantara	Maha Menwantara
	14	or 857 x 14	or 857 x 14
28	28	11 $\frac{36}{17}$	11 $\frac{36}{71}$
30	15	Mahas, divine ages	Maha divine ages
32	4	Surga sidenta	Sarya midhanta
36	6	Vedasis	Veda is
37	1	informs, that	informs us, that
45	4	in Note	Vide page 325
54	13	Letter	Swayambhava here and else- where
	16	Vadma calpiya	Swa'yambhuva Padma-calpiya
57	11	I have little	I have seen little
	16	Teshwacu	Icawwacu
	19	Bharatwaya	Bharadwaja
	22	Valvaswator	Valvaswai, or
59	7	first Avatara	Fish Avatara
	1	in Note	Sixth Menwantara
65	10	Letter	and tenth Satyavator, vator
68	18	1500 years (the purana says during the sleep of Brahma the Vedas having been stolen A. M. 460) they express it	1500 years, the purana says during the sleep of Brahma: The Vedas having been stol- en A. M. 460, they express it
69	27	180 days	180 years
87	8	for a time	for the time
91	12	Straddha-diva	Straddha-deva
	6	(the race of Seth and Cain descended)	(the race of Cain and Seth) descended
100	13	Hindu. Adam	Hindu Adam,
103	2	Alorus	Alorus
		1 Swarochesha	1 Swa'ro'chisha
		2 Auttama	2 Auttami
		3 Tamasa	3 Tamasa
		5 Chur'shesha	5 Cha'chusha
115	22	Dubistan here and elsewhere	Dabistan
122	17	Mugadha here and elsewhere	Magadha
126	1	Maza	Maya
129	3	to an assertion	to ascertain
	10	divine Buddha 3365	divine Buddha 3361
141	Second age	Yagati	Yayati
152	10	Letter	Jarasandha
159	14	Letter II.	Cha'chusha here and elsewhere
165	23	thirty-ninth	twenty-ninth
166	19	Swarochas here and elsewhere	Swa'ro'chisha
167	5	the year 1564	the year B. C. 1564
	13	900+156=1056	900+156=1056

ERRATA.

Page	Line	FOR	READ
170	24	righteous	Omit the word righteous and enter the Note as part of the Letter changing the word <i>more</i> in the third line to <i>one</i>
173	Table VII.	Yagati	Yayati
176	3 Letter	Mathusael, here and elsewhere	Methusael
179	2 in Note	If Iustasi	If Turvasu
	2	Lobu	Zabil
	4	three elder brothers	four elder brothers
180	5 in Note	to Jurvam	to Turvasu
184	20 Letter	190137	1901397
185	24	Divadosa here and elsewhere	Devadosa
189	4	Smritu	Smriti
	13	Maha-bati	Maha-Bati
190	Table	Salyavator Cainan	Salyavator Cainan
199	Table	Rama or Jared	Rama Jared
200	5 Letter	Sward'chisha	Swa'to'chisha
	8	Uyasa	Vyasa
202	10	Dueuratha	Dasaratha
205	Table	Maru exempt from death or Enoch	Maru exempt from death or Enoch
207	Table	Marudeva Methuselab	Marudeva Methuselab
	1 Letter	dynasties which became	dynasties become
211	5	A. M. 920	A. M. 902
212	2	p. 150	p. 151
212	4 Letter III.	Iwarochisha	Swa'to'chisha
223	11	Dasaratha	Dasaratha
229	2	Vijitaswa	Vijitasva
230	12	Lord	Lord
232	3	Eber his grandson	Eber his great-grandson
	17	the twenty-first	the twenty, first
236	14	Surya sidhanta	Surya Siddhanta
237	18	Smriti	Smriti
250	25	of Moses	of Krishna or Moses
264	Note	sons of	son of
269	23 Letter	363	365
270	11	Calpa	Calpi
273	9	by four years	by twenty-four years
284	Table	4 Janasa	4 Janasa
287	Table	Antediluvian patriarch 14 Ham 13	Antediluvian Patriarchs 14 Ham 15
292	6 Letter	A. M. 1616	A. M. 1656
302	22	Priests of Belus	Priest of Belus
306	21	progenitor Ham,	progenitor Ham.—
322	9	Chou	Chou
326	16	Ta-nue	Ta-nu-o
337	26	Admitting therefore Fohi	admitting Fohi
340	3	the Brahmans place at	the Brahmans at
343	13	by the latter	by the former
348	10	724 50 728	724 to 728
349	16	assigned 83100 or 115 years	assigned 83, 100 or 115 years
358	8	Annadotus	Annedotus
360	11	the fish deity	the fish deity
	Note	Fauillus	Fauibus
363	17 Letter	Metsya Avatar	Matsya Avatar
364	13	Nannacus; others Annacus	Nannacus; others Annacus
366	20	this appears	this applies
367	2	Chrissa	Chrissa
373	28	extended	intended
374	10	of a people	of people
383	26	New world	New world.
386	3	scorching	scorching
390	1	737 were	757 years were



